

Local planning in inner city residential areas: studies of Leeds and Manchester 1966-1986

Timothy C. Marshall (1990)

<https://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/items/a1f4f945-18ae-419f-86c9-b3bd423f7058/1/>

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this work, the full bibliographic details must be given as follows:

Marshall, T C (1990) *Local planning in inner city residential areas: studies of Leeds and Manchester 1966-1986*  
PhD, Oxford Brookes University

**LOCAL PLANNING IN INNER CITY RESIDENTIAL AREAS:  
STUDIES OF LEEDS AND MANCHESTER 1966-1986**

**Timothy Charles Marshall**

A thesis submitted to the Council for National Academic Awards in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Oxford Polytechnic

September 1990



## IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

[www.bl.uk](http://www.bl.uk)

**PAGE/PAGES EXCLUDED  
UNDER INSTRUCTION  
FROM THE UNIVERSITY**

## CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. The Contributions of Previous Studies	28
3. An Analytical and Conceptual Framework	66
4. Local Planning Approaches in Leeds and Manchester	92
5. Local Planning in Two Leeds Neighbourhoods	125
6. Local Planning in Two Manchester Neighbourhoods	185
7. Conclusions	240
References	269
Maps	

## APPENDICES

1. Sources for Leeds	1
2. Sources for Manchester	7
3. Research Method	13
4. Local Social Relations and Community Action	22



## FIGURES

1. Dimensions of Local Planning
2. Factors influencing the adoption of local planning approaches for inner areas
3. Periodisation of Local Planning for inner residential areas
4. Use or Non-Use of Local Planning Frameworks in Selected Larger English Cities
5. Nature of Local Planning in Leeds 1966-86
6. Significance of Influences on Local Planning in Leeds 1966-86
7. Nature of Local Planning in Manchester 1966-86
8. Significance of Influences on Local Planning in Manchester 1966-86
9. Socio-Economic Characteristics 1971-81
10. Council Control in Leeds and Manchester 1966-86
11. Social and Demographic Statistics in Harehills and Richmond Hill
12. Local Planning Processes and Outcomes in Selected Episodes in Harehills and Richmond Hill
13. Influence of Selected Factors on Processes and Outcomes of Local Planning in Particular Episodes in Harehills and Richmond Hill
14. Social and Demographic Characteristics in Gorton North and Moss Side
15. Local Planning Processes and Outcomes in Selected Episodes in Gorton North and Moss Side
16. Influence of Selected Factors on Processes and Outcomes of Local Planning in Particular Episodes in Gorton North and Moss Side
17. Dimensions of Local Planning in Inner Older Residential Areas of Major English Cities
18. The Use of Channels of Local Influence.

## MAPS

1. The Growth of Leeds 1912-74
2. Manchester - Wards 1987
3. Leeds - the Location of Study Areas
4. Harehills study area
5. Harehills in Revised Development Plan 1972
6. Harehills - Proposals Map April 1981
7. Richmond Hill study area
8. Richmond Hill in Revised Development Plan 1972
9. Richmond Hill - East Leeds Radial Alternative Routes 1981
10. Rank Optics site Harehills
11. 'Dodge City' site Harehills
12. Local Centre, Richmond Hill (Planning Brief 1981)
13. Local Centre Richmond Hill (1986 Proposals)
14. Manchester - Location of study areas
15. Gorton North (1969 Plan for Gorton and West Gorton)
16. Housing programmes in Gorton North (1982 Area Information booklet)
17. Moss Side (1971 Plan for Moss Side)
18. Housing programmes in Moss Side (1982 Area Information booklet)
19. Shopping centre proposed layout, Gorton North (1978 development brief)
20. Hyde Road sites Gorton North (1982 committee report)
21. Gore Brook Valley Park (Committee report 1984)
22. Walmer St allocations Moss Side (Committee report 1986)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to all the people who helped me with the studies in Leeds and Manchester. They are all (I hope) listed in the Appendices and I will only single out for special thanks my primary contacts: Tony Shelton and Eric Bowen in Leeds City Council and Ted Kitchen in Manchester City Council. All three were most helpful in arranging access or suggesting other people I should talk to outside the councils.

The Economic and Social Research Council financed the first two years of my work through a Linked Studentship. The School of Planning at Oxford Polytechnic has been a very sympathetic and comfortable base for my period of study. Many staff and research students have given valuable support; it helps a lot to be surrounded by nice people. In addition I would like to thank the School of Planning for supporting my third year of study. Jane Woolfrey and Ruth Dyer did the majority of the typing, and in the Town Planning Office Sue Bartlett was especially helpful wherever practical problems arose.

By far my largest debt is to my supervisors, Patsy Healey and Mike Gibson. Both were in at the beginning, supporting me in starting the research and both have stuck by the project, along its sometimes far from direct trajectory. I am very grateful to both.

## **ABSTRACT**

### **Local Planning in Inner City Residential Areas: Studies of Leeds and Manchester 1966-1986**

**T. C. MARSHALL**

A new phase of local planning began in the 1970s in the major English cities, as redevelopment of older residential areas began to give way to rehabilitation. This phase has not been intensively studied in the planning literature. This study seeks to assess the contribution of local planning to the processes of renewal in these inner residential areas, with a special interest in arrangements which may give residents of these areas better control over the outcomes. The research examines the factors which conditioned the approach to local planning in each city and each neighbourhood, with case studies of two neighbourhoods in Leeds and two in Manchester. At the citywide level Manchester council's form of Labour politics is seen as generally discouraging the use of local planning frameworks, with the retention of a more centralised council administration. Analysis of the joint operation of a wide range of factors is emphasised as necessary to understand the kinds of local planning adopted and the effects these had. In particular the variation present within each neighbourhood and in each case or episode is seen as significant in influencing local planning processes and outcomes. After 1974 there was less likelihood of even informal area frameworks being used, and greater tendencies towards ad hoc planning decisions on individual cases. It is concluded that extensive changes are needed to make local planning more responsive: changes particularly in the overall resourcing and programming context in which local planning operates, and in the procedures used within planning, above all those for involving local interests and in the way municipal administration is organised. The housing renewal system introduced in 1990 (with Renewal Areas) might, if suitably applied, help to facilitate such a form of more responsive local planning.

**A      The Research Issue and the Research Questions**

**B      Interest in the Research Issue**

- 1      Personal Interests
- 2      Practice-related Interests
- 3      Academic Interest
- 4      Summary

**C      The Dimensions of Local Planning**

- 1      Large City Local Planning
- 2      Inner Residential Area Local Planning

**D      Research Strategy**

- 1      Overall Strategy
- 2      Detailed Methodology

**E      Thesis Structure**

### A The Research Issue and the Research Questions

The purpose of this investigation is to improve understanding of local planning in a particular English context - the older inner residential areas of the major cities. Through better understanding it is intended that the interests of those based in these areas (mainly residents) may be furthered, whether through their own action or by action by politicians, government officials or others on their behalf.

This object of research stems from personal interests as well as the broader concerns voiced in planning practice and in academic debates. These concerns will be examined later but first further comments on the research context and on the nature of 'local planning' are necessary, and the research issue will be detailed into specific questions.

The research context refers to those inner residential areas of the English cities primarily built before 1914, rather than those parts which have been redeveloped after that date, mainly in the 1950s and 1960s.

This is by no means a hard and fast limitation, as it is an important fact that redevelopment has been both spatially scattered and has had profound effects on areas not redeveloped. However, the limited focus does serve to identify a specific era of urban renewal in English cities, when redevelopment was becoming less all-powerful and rehabilitation gradually became the norm of physical treatment of residential areas.

Furthermore it will be evident that a concentration on areas of residence does not exclude consideration of land uses which have been mixed in with or developed adjacent to those areas. The emphasis only serves to avoid investigating those large blocks of commercial, retail or industrial uses which exist in most major English cities.

It will be noted that 'major' cities are referred to. This arises from a judgement that the larger cities in England share some common spatial-historical features which have given them some degree of similarity. This judgement rests on both personal

acquaintance with many of the cities and the research on inner cities undertaken especially in the last decade (see for example Hausner and Begg, 1986, and Robson, 1988).

These areas have been a focus of major state intervention in the post war period, witnessing the shift from redevelopment to rehabilitation - a shift which occurred at differing speeds and dates in different cities. The areas were composed of a significant diversity of types of neighbourhoods, first analysed in the 1960s in terms such as 'reception', 'transient' or 'twilight' areas, especially with reference to black settlement in these cities, as against less fluid and more traditional white working class areas. In the 1970s and 1980s analysis has proceeded more in terms of housing market or housing function, but retaining an understanding that these areas often remain socially and physically problematic, experiencing various degrees of physical and environmental decay and a range of social stresses. The areas have as well varying inheritances of physical form, some very densely built up and almost purely residential, some at lower densities and with far more local facilities. A significant range of state programmes have, especially since the mid 1970s, directed resources at the perceived environmental and social problems of these neighbourhoods.

The diversity of these neighbourhoods, within the 'big city' similarities mentioned above, is an important theme in this work. It will be argued in Chapters 2 and 3 that the variable nature of each neighbourhood has been insufficiently stressed in previous studies, and that it may plausibly be proposed as a significant factor in determining the forms and outcomes of local planning.

The activity 'local planning' is taken to be a specific purpose, the allocation of land uses and activities by a state, or state authorised agency, with an awareness of spatial interrelations, at a level specific enough to be related directly to implementation of schemes. In the period studied here, this was a task, or set of tasks, undertaken primarily by professionally trained town planners working within planning departments of municipal authorities. However, there were certainly other actors involved in the activity, notably other parts of the municipalities, more or less independent local or non-local associations and central government agencies.

It can not be claimed that this definition of local planning is unproblematic. Any idea of what is 'planning' is immediately difficult, and the word 'local' added on

can add to the complexity. The definition is deliberately linked to its period and place; the same set of words would have very different resonances in other societies or times. Nevertheless the key components are necessary for a definition precise enough for analytical purposes:

1. land use and activity allocation;
2. by authoritative agency (here, a state agency, normally);
3. at a level closely related to implementation of schemes;
4. with awareness of the interrelationships of activities in space.

The loss of any one component means that the needed specificity of the concept disappears and one runs into definitional quicksands. It excludes certain possible contents of the concept, especially the idea that local planning is equivalent to the corporate or general planning of a neighbourhood, or that local planning could be carried out purely by market forces. Here the concentration is on the land uses and the built environment of localities. But this still leaves open some possible variation of the content of local planning, and a range of dimensions of form and process.

This definition can be compared with those in two well known local planning texts. Healey (1983) argued that local planning, like planning, means nothing until its object or content is specified. She considered that the core of that object is in state land policy; to get further than that it was necessary to specify the purposes of such policy. Bruton and Nicholson (1987) see town and country planning as managing change in the environment through the production of land use plans and the control of development. They do not state precisely how the local part of town and country planning is to be distinguished from the non-local (strategic, regional) - much of their discussion is of the planning system as a whole. They imply that the process is one led by government/state agencies.

Although these two texts identify more or less confidently the object (land, environment) and the agency (state), both are reluctant to give too precise or detailed definition. This appears sensible, the result of the inherent flexibility of 'local planning'. The definition given here is compatible with those in these two texts but seeks to specify more precisely the 'local' element of planning.



That is to say, whilst local planning is here taken to have a quite closely specified purpose, that purpose can be achieved by several instruments, used in several ways. The most important instruments are local planning frameworks and area oriented forward planning elements of housing and other public programmes. The statutory processes of development control are clearly another instrument within the planning system, but only limited attention has been given to this aspect in this study. This was partly done in order to reduce certain elements of fieldwork, but more significantly it was apparent from personal experience and from literature survey that, in most inner areas, development control mechanisms have been of lesser importance, given the weak private development pressure (outside London); this was evident for example in the inner area studies of Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak - henceforth Healey et al - 1988. Public programmes are particularly significant in the study context, given the low incomes of most residents and the normal unwillingness of the private sector to invest in older inner residential areas. The most important programmes in this context are those for housing, transport, social facilities (education, health, recreation) and more recently economic development, backed up by Urban Programme funding which goes in part to voluntary organisations. These instruments have been developed and combined in different ways in different cities, making up distinct approaches to local planning. These approaches though are then put into practice quite variably in different districts and neighbourhoods - not only the instruments used, but the objectives or content of local planning and the processes involved in using them have differed. The links on to implementation have also varied. These dimensions of local planning, shown in Figure 1, will be considered further in Section C.

Therefore, despite the overall common features of the study context, substantial variation in local planning experience is to be expected. The research seeks to chart and explain this variation and consider how future practice can respond more appropriately to different local circumstances.

1. Objectives and Content:

extent of planning effects proposed via the instruments, specifying particular programmes, designating land uses or activities etc.

2. Instruments :

forms of plan or other spatially oriented framework used (or not used).

3. Processes:

ways in which planning is carried out, within varying institutions and with different forms of interest involvement.

4. Links to Implementation:

extent to which planning is linked to mechanisms for implementation, via public programmes, local organisations, partnerships etc.

---

Within the overall research issue, there are four specific questions to be tackled:-

- (i) what was the approach to local planning in each city, and how was this carried through in specific neighbourhoods;
- (ii) what produced the above local planning;
- (iii) what effects did local planning have for older, inner residential areas and for those people living in them;
- (iv) what changes of approach and implementation would improve the results for the residents in these neighbourhoods.

These questions are evidently connected. If answers can be obtained to the first three, then it should be possible to understand what changes would produce more beneficial effects, and to specify the situations which would be more likely to permit

such changes. As will be evident in the later section on research method and strategies, it is not suggested that a fixed set of ingredients can be proposed which will lead to specific results. Rather the search is for varying kinds of combinations which may be put together by actors to fit each new situation.

The rest of this introduction will concentrate on three aspects of the research issue. Firstly the sources of interest in the issue will be discussed. Then some of the dimensions of variation of local planning will be sketched out, to give an initial grasp of the research object. Finally the research method and strategies will be presented (detailed discussion is included as Appendix 3).

## **B Interest in the Research Issue**

The issue is important for both practice/policy and academic reasons. Before these are examined, the reasons for my personal interest will be briefly explained.

### **1. Personal Interests**

To a very large extent the research interest grew out of my own practice, during the nine years (1976-85) spent working in the urban renewal programme of Birmingham Council, within the Planning Department. This is not to say that there were not some more academic understandings inherited from the period of professional qualification before 1976. However during the period in planning practice I was only in very limited contact with academic work on local planning -via occasional 'continued professional development'. Subsequently during the research period more academic concerns came to be of considerable interest, replacing to some degree the more practice related issues at first foremost. But my own practical understandings were still important. This remained significant during the research, providing a distinctive perspective, alongside purely academic investigation.

This issue of the relationship between practice and academic work has been considered by Schon (1983). He examined 'reflective practice and research', discussing how professionals actually frame the issues with which they deal day to day. He notes that there can be strong limits on 'reflection-in-action'. In his treatment of planning he analyses a situation where the planner does not analyse his

frame of operation, nor develop his 'repertoire' or 'reflect-in-action', as Schon recommends a professional should. He recommends (1983 pp 307-325) that 'reflective research' should be carried out by practitioners, or by academics with practitioners, which encourages the ability for undertaking 'frame analysis', 'repertoire building' and 'reflection in action'. For the purposes of this study it is not proposed that practice is analysed in these terms. The intention is simply to emphasise that the study comes from a practice base, heightening awareness of the issues of the relationship of practice and academic knowledge. It is appropriate therefore to give a brief account here of the practice and of my own motivations and values.

My work centred throughout my employment on the preparation and implementation of local plans and projects within Birmingham's inner areas, as part of urban renewal and inner areas programmes. My interest in this work stemmed primarily from a concern to support those 'losing out' in these areas, through lack of resources and power - a redistributive emphasis that is to say. This concern for better lives for those resident in these areas, a redistribution of power and resources through public programmes and participation, continued into the research process. Thus although the research has been undertaken, as far as possible, in an impartial manner, it has come from a partisan rather than neutral political and social viewpoint. Not surprisingly that viewpoint was also affected by the research process, so that my political and social understandings were somewhat changed at the end of that process; but they remained within the same overall set of framing values. How this relates to my overall understanding of the process of social research will become clearer in Section D (and Appendix 3) below.

## 2. Practice-related Interests

Since at least the later 1960s the role that local planning might play, especially in the inner cities, has been a problematic issue within the planning profession and has been considered by academics in close touch with planning practice. Of course in a general sense the issue has been present since late nineteenth century planning thought, given one of its emphases on the housing question and the eradication of slums. However from the later 1960s onwards the role of local planning came to be discussed in nearer to its contemporary form, with the processes leading up to the local planning component of the 1968 Act, including the 1965 Planning Advisory Group (PAG) report and the Skeffington report of 1969 on public participation. The

PAG report proposed the statutory Local Plan, to accompany strategic Structure Plans, and this became part of the planning system in the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act. The PAG proposals reflected an unease arising from the implementation of massive state organised redevelopment programmes and the perceived need to invent a more flexible and manageable planning process (see for example the account in Healey et al - 1988, Chapter 2). At the same time the 'rediscovery' of poverty and concern about immigration and racism led to the series of 'urban experiments' from 1969 onwards, including the Community Development Projects (CDPs) and Inner Area Studies (IASs) (see the account in Gibson and Langstaff, 1982).

But very early on writers such as Muchnick (1970), who examined inner city renewal and planning practice in the mid-1960s in Liverpool, were emphasising the extreme difficulties in achieving successful implementation of PAG style local plans in inner areas. Muchnick expected to see "the ineffectiveness of the new planning system unless changes are also made in the political and organisational structure surrounding renewal" (Muchnick 1970, p116). Thus the high hopes raised by the new system were already being questioned - and from within the very places where influential members of PAG had been active - in Liverpool (Muchnick) and in Newcastle (Davies 1972). The search for the reasons for local planning's difficulties in this context continued through the 1970s. Already in 1972 the SNAP project in Liverpool argued that the sectoralism of central government was an important factor, along with municipal departmentalism (Shelter Neighbourhood Action Project 1972). The split of the planning system and profession with the new 1974 counties and districts tended to further weaken enthusiasm for local planning, as for some years strategic planning was seen as a prior necessity.

By the mid-1970s many practitioners were beginning to doubt the extent to which either statutory or informal local plans could be helpful in the inner city, although others were still more enthusiastic (as the theme issues in 'The Planner' show - Perry 1974, Perry 1976). At that stage the debate centred around the possibility of carrying out 'comprehensive, corporate, community' local planning, as some of the CDPs and IASs had been advocating. This would have been a form of local planning with significant control by neighbourhood interests and uniting action by all council departments and public agencies. There was an increasing awareness from the mid-1970s of the difficulties such local planning would involve, and a rising insistence by the Department of Environment that local planning, and especially statutory Local

Plans, was concerned with land use, not with attempting to plan socially or economically on a comprehensive basis.

Many planners working in older residential areas saw the instruments available under the Housing Acts, for GIAs and HAAs, as a substitute, even if inadequate, for local planning instruments within the Planning Acts. However they normally recognised that these housing-based tools also had their limitations in any search for comprehensive approaches and often fashioned new inter-disciplinary and inter-agency mechanisms to try to plan and implement area improvement schemes.

The main result of the mid-1970s debates was the increasing importance given to inner city issues within central government, via the 1977-78 Inner City Initiatives, rather than any attempt to develop the planning or housing instruments which could be relevant for older, inner residential areas. Inner Area Programmes/Inner City Partnerships became a major focus of local authority/central government interest from 1978 until at least the early 1980s (see Lawless 1989). However indirectly this was to be significant for local planning, as it was to provide resources both for a range of struggling public programmes and for increasing numbers of local voluntary projects, building on the Urban Programme funding of the previous decade.

How inner city local planning might be developed was only of tangential concern throughout the 1980s, whether one observes the creation of new radical or progressive forms by such proponents of 'local socialism' as the GLC, or central government's desire to promote new centralised or privatised forms (Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989 present this range). Discussion rarely at this time proceeded in anything like the terms of 'local planning in the inner areas' and neighbourhood issues had a lower salience than in the 1970s. Central and local government both tended to switch to a project based orientation, with more concern about issues of economic regeneration, the treatment of recently built housing estates and the operation of inner area programmes than with local - or city - planning as such. The authority wide planning process has made something of a comeback since 1986 with the requirement to prepare Unitary Development Plans; but even this has been somewhat muted in most areas.

However, when viewed through the more academic focus of research programmes such as those of Healey et al (1988) or Bruton and Nicholson (1987), the issues

discussed in the mid-1970s remain evident - the organisation of programmes of intervention locally in these areas and the role of planning instruments in that organisation. The relative occlusion of local planning in most practice-based literature and discussions since 1977-78 is not, it can be argued, the result of the unimportance of these issues. It is rather that political, ideological and economic circumstances have worked against either central or local government focusing back on to these neighbourhoods. This does not mean that local planning, as defined above, has not occurred; but in most inner urban areas in the 1980s it has been a secondary activity, little discussed and with only occasional use of guiding frameworks. Nevertheless the social and physical problems faced by those living in these areas have not disappeared and the issue remains as to how forms of coordinated public intervention might best be planned - if such intervention were to be promoted by government. Evidently the PAG report's hopes were destroyed by not one, but several massive changes of context in the 1970s and 1980s. But one has only to look at the circulars on area renewal issued in 1990 to appreciate that the role of local planning in the state's treatment of older, inner residential areas remains of importance. This new renewal context will be examined in the final chapter.

In the 1990s there are several changes which could push local planning in these areas forward again and therefore could justify a continuing or revived interest from practice. One would be a change in general ideological climate, giving renewed legitimacy to certain kinds of public intervention, though these would be likely to be very different from those of the 1970s.

A second shift would be one that refocused interest on the inner, older residential areas, if these came to be regarded again as in need of urgent physical and infrastructural treatment, along with the declining redeveloped areas; this could be associated with a greater concern with environmental quality as a whole.

A third shift, related to the first two, would be a renewed concern with issues of social and community development, possibly supported by controversies around racial and other social divisions, even some rediscovery of 'neighbourhood'.

All of these shifts would raise, in varying ways, issues of the detailed implementation of public initiatives in the areas concerned, each with an unavoidably spatial and very locally specific component. They would thus bring local planning as part of practice

back towards the centre of planners' activities. Of course none of the above shifts are at all inevitable; if they do not occur, practice interest will remain more dormant and submerged. The most that is argued here is that if, from broader forces, such changes occur, better understanding of local planning practice will be particularly beneficial. In the final chapter it will be possible to look at these issues in a fuller and more developed manner.

### 3. Academic Interest

Reference has already been made to continuing if sporadic academic interest in local planning as such, from the later 1960s to the much more generalised studies of the mid 1980s. There are however also some broader academic currents, from quite varying intellectual sources, which encourage investigation of the very localised 'community based' processes which are related to the processes involved in local planning. In the most general sense these are related to the processes of "subjectification" noted by Thrift (1987, p402), which has focused attention on the agency role of the structure-agency duality, on the constitution of subjects, on consciousness and its sources. Certainly this is nothing new in itself and is partly a reaction to more structuralist leanings in the 1970s, the way being led by the 'structurationist' social theorising of Giddens (eg 1979). Some writers such as Raymond Williams always maintained this dual tension in their thinking (most notably displayed in urban matters in Williams 1973). However the more recent intellectual tendencies encourage more precise consideration of specific agents, within an understanding of the power of general structuring. Space is seen to matter in this process. Thus Thrift (1987 p 402) refers to how local contexts can contain "all manner of unexpected combinations of 'universal' social relations". (In Chapter 3 the difficult questions related to what one may mean by 'structuring' and 'spatial levels' are discussed briefly; here it is simply noted that these are problematic).

The 'turn towards agency' has been reflected in the flowering of 'locality studies' in the later 1980s, led by the major research project on seven English localities (cities, towns or large parts of cities) reported in Cooke (1989). Although the Cooke et al study reflects greater concern with agency, this generally reaches down only to the city or district wide level, not to the more localised aspects which were the subject



of some of the 'community studies' tradition in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s. One purpose in this investigation is to follow this thread more specifically into neighbourhoods. Thus the following question is taken from page 1 of Cooke (1989); "Are there, in other words, locally rooted social processes capable of projecting the interests of locality members well beyond the local political arena, and what might those processes be?". The same question can be directed at very local processes formed by neighbourhood social relations and has a bearing on consideration of local planning.

In a broader sociological perspective there has been some renewed consideration of 'Community' from a spectrum of viewpoints. Willmott (1986, 1989) for example, continuing a lifelong concern, considers that there is some basis for community-oriented policies (in terms of both 'territorial' and 'interest' communities), but that most places and most interest groups are communities to only a limited extent. The study described here does not assume that some strong form of 'place-related community' exists or has recently existed in older, inner residential areas; but the possibility of forms of mobilisation or pressure based on varying dimensions of neighbourhood based social relations is an important subject of the investigation. It will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

Harvey shows, perhaps more surprisingly, recent interest in the role of neighbourhood based social relations, seeing the community of residential areas as one of several possible bases (with classes, families/households, individuals and capital) of urban consciousness (see Harvey 1989 pp 231-236). He suggests that the 'community' of middle class and of very poor neighbourhoods is of a very different character, one being controlling and exclusionary, the other more trapped, for survival (Harvey 1989, pp 265-267).

These two authors are cited simply as indications of wider interest in local social relations, which suggest the possibility of fertile academic interaction between local planning concerns and broader social theory. To put it in slightly different recent terminology, the movement of 'civil society' is seen as of real importance, along with and in relation to broad economic forces and state activities. From an academic viewpoint this suggests a potential for making connections which is so far unrealised, but encourages current investigation.

#### 4. Summary

In 1985, when the research was begun, it was evident that a significant area of planning practice had been little investigated. A decade of intense local planning activity had passed in the inner areas of the larger English cities, generally linked to neighbourhood rehabilitation, without an assessment of this experience. Whilst there had long been pessimism about the chances for effective local planning in these areas, some sort of local planning, as defined above, had continued, despite the worsening context and often general disillusionment. Whilst some general explanations of the difficulties of inner area local planning had been proposed, there had been little focus on the ways in which the detailed variation of neighbourhoods and the planning practice in them had influenced the effectiveness of planning. Although the framework within which local planning was undertaken was clearly changing in the mid-1980s, it was considered that many of the issues that had dominated debate and practice in the previous decade would remain current in the future. The view from planning practice in 1990 is that this is the case; whilst the conditions for a 'comeback' of neighbourhood planning in these contexts (discussed above) have not yet materialised, they do not seem remote - perhaps less remote than in 1985. It is still important to consider how the interests of residents in these areas may be included in the future treatment of their areas and not suffer local planning solutions imposed purely from above - wherever 'above' may be. It has been argued that some academic concerns of social science in the 1980s bolster such investigation of very localised processes and social relations, able to focus on the general (or 'structural') and the specific (or 'contingent' - these phrasings will be discussed further later) at the same time. It is not proposed that this research will contribute directly to the academic debates on 'society and space', but it is helpful that the study is operating in a field which is of current academic interest.

## C The Dimensions of Local Planning

Before the more detailed examination of the literature in Chapter 2, it will be helpful to give an overview of the main dimensions of local planning practice in the study context. This is simply descriptive - the search for explanation begins in Chapter 2.

The sources for this exploration will be threefold:

1. several general studies of English local planning published in the 1980s, particularly Bruton and Nicholson (1987), Healey (1983), Healey et al (1988), Fudge et al (1983) and, for four cities, Farnell (1983);
2. articles on particular cities by practitioners; and
3. visits to twelve local authorities undertaken early in the research period, at the beginning of 1986. These included four London boroughs, as well as Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, Manchester, Salford and Wirral. In each case information was obtained by interviewing planning officers and examining planning documents.

Given the varying aims and range of these data sources, the following generalisations must be treated as broadly indicative rather than finally conclusive. For example even the most extensive sampling (aiming at 100% of authorities), that by Bruton and Nicholson, only achieved a 50% response rate in the metropolitan districts (which cover a significant proportion of inner areas). However on many issues the evidence as a whole points in the same directions and can be taken as convincing. Only the broad outlines are being touched here; several cities' experience will reappear in more detail in later chapters.

The wider context, of large city local planning, will first be described, leading into treatment of inner residential areas local planning. In this description local planning will be treated along four main dimensions - content, instruments, process and links to implementation (see Figure 1). These dimensions follow the sense, if not the exact divisions, of the studies conducted at Oxford Polytechnic published in Healey et al, 1985, 1988. Attention will be directed mainly at the question of the instruments used, especially the use of spatial frameworks. This is because there is much less

information available on the other dimensions and therefore it is harder to generalise with any confidence. Broadly speaking local planning has divided its energies, in terms of content, between allocating sites to particular uses and attempting to coordinate programmes directed to particular areas (occasionally with control of some budgets, such as for environmental improvements). Older, inner residential areas have seen considerable experimentation with original forms of planning processes, with new kinds of public participation and localised council administration - but the extent has varied considerably from one authority to another, and within each authority.

Questions of the links to implementation have been at the heart of inner area planning practice, in view of the frequent difficulty in allocating resources (from the public sector) or attracting investment (from the private sector). This has been one of the main motors behind changes in practice, encouraging an orientation towards more continuous planning and less use of forward planning frameworks.

#### 1. Large City Local Planning

One of the main areas of contention amongst practitioners was whether to make statutory local plans. Though clearly not the only instrument available, there is little doubt that at the beginning of the 1970s many planners assumed that this newly invented tool would have an important role, in inner areas as elsewhere. However it has turned out that there has been a strong but not universal tendency in the major cities to avoid statutory plan making. Of plans deposited by the end of 1980 only four were for inner areas of metropolitan districts and 10 for London boroughs (about 15% of the total) (Healey 1983 p 110). Healey concluded then that "outside London, local plans for inner city areas are not common and are typically for very small areas" (1983 p 115).

Bruton and Nicholson's later survey (March 1985) told the same story (Bruton and Nicholson 1987, Table 6.5, p 259) - a generally low production rate of statutory plans in the larger urban areas outside London. This was emphasised by several practitioners from the late 1970s onwards (eg Adcock 1979, Wenban Smith 1983). Looking at the historical shift the key period was the mid 1970s, 1974-76, when disillusionment set in; most inner city practitioners began to see statutory plans as unnecessary or even counter-productive. The change can be seen by looking at the major English cities, using published sources and information collected in 1986.

Thus Birmingham only produced statutory plans covering a small proportion of the city, including one for the city centre, one for a city fringe development area and one for an inner city district, whose content continued to change from its inception in 1974 to its near completion a decade later (Urwin and Wenban Smith 1983). Liverpool abandoned statutory plan making early on after an inner area exercise failed in 1975-76 (Duerden 1978, Hayes 1981). Manchester confined its statutory planning to the city centre and some river valley frameworks (Healey 1984). Leeds produced more statutory plans, for both its city centre and for a range of outer and rural areas, but showed continuing hesitation with the areas in between, following the problems with an attempted inner district plan in 1974-76 (Farnell 1983, Shelton 1985). Sheffield proved equally reluctant to move towards full coverage, although by 1982 four plans were shortly to be adopted and two were ready for deposit, out of 33 plan areas (Bajaria 1982, Fudge et al 1983). Newcastle was similarly retreating after early experience with the time consuming processes of producing one plan, deciding in 1981 to reduce the list of plans proposed significantly (Bruton and Nicholson 1987, pp 264-265). Bristol spent most of its energies on the Docks Plan, with only very slow progress on some inner area plans by the mid-1980s (Farnell 1983).

The picture is therefore of a general reluctance to produce statutory plans, especially from the late 1970s onwards. Some authorities, such as Leeds, Sheffield and Manchester, at times continued to play with the idea of full statutory coverage into the early 1980s, but drew back each time. Generally, outside a number of limited and specialised contexts, such plans were avoided. It is true that some slightly smaller authorities have sought full statutory coverage and were by the mid 1980s nearing their goal - Salford (Healey et al 1988) and Leicester (Farnell 1983, Fudge et al 1983). But some which had proclaimed this goal up to about 1980, such as Wirral (see Adcock 1979) in the end avoided progressing their plans through to a statutory form. The reasons given for this shift will be examined in Chapter 2. In any case Bruton and Nicholson's conclusion is correct, that there was "a widespread professional feeling that ... local plans ... are less appropriate in inner areas" (1987 p 204).

What is also evident is that the drift from statutory planmaking also represented a drift to many kinds of informal planning frameworks. Thus Bruton and Nicholson's survey in 1983 revealed 20.4 non-statutory instruments in use, on average, per London borough and 32.4 per metropolitan district (1987 Table 6.5 p 259). Both metropolitan

districts and London boroughs were active under most of the nine headings under which these local planning instruments were classified, especially on development control/practice policy notes, development briefs, informal local plans, single topic based frameworks and special area work (1987 Table 6.4, p 256). These are generally less like local planning frameworks and more connected to the two additional instruments identified earlier - development control mechanisms and public programmes. Towards the development control end of the spectrum they fit less firmly into 'local planning' as defined in this study as they normally show less awareness of local spatial interrelationships. Nevertheless it is clear that, by the time of Bruton and Nicholson's survey, 'local planning' in the major cities meant a very broad spread of activity beyond the bounds of the statutory system. These overall authority approaches both affected and were much influenced by the local planning undertaken in the inner residential areas.

## 2. Inner Residential Area Local Planning

The information available on the use of local planning frameworks in the specific context (inner residential areas) in these cities is less good than that on the cities as a whole. As detailed, extensive researches were not undertaken for this purpose, the evidence will have to be culled rather tangentially from the major studies, backed by my own survey described above. The interrelatedness of form, content and implementation will be evident in this description.

Firstly, where statutory plan exercises existed implementation problems occurred; there was generally a relatively weak link between the main decision making agencies and the plan, with plans tending to reflect decisions rather than inform or dictate them; this judgement arises from an understanding of the problems experienced with several inner city plans in the late 1970s and from information on the statutory plans in Salford and Leicester. The case reported in Healey et al (1988 pp 82-86), for a very small primarily residential area in Salford, was probably exceptional in the extent to which a degree of spatial linking was achieved in relation to programming decisions. This was no doubt facilitated by concentrating planning energies on such a small area.

Much more often exercises of this type were carried out by a range of informal frameworks. Thus many of the non-statutory plans in Sheffield were for housing

renewal areas (Fudge et al 1983). Birmingham had a fairly fully developed system of production of informal local plans for nearly all renewal areas, following on the practice in the redevelopment programme (as exemplified in Healey et al 1988 pp 92-96). In Leicester plans for renewal areas generally flowed from the Housing Department's teams, often led by planners, subsequently reflected in statutory plan exercises. In Leeds there was less tendency to produce even informal frameworks, although these did materialise in certain areas, particularly between 1978-82, whilst Manchester was often at the most informal end of the spectrum, working sectorally and via citywide mechanisms separate from the locally established housing renewal procedures, although sometimes based on informal plans produced in the early 1970s. (For these two cities the case studies explore the experience fully in Chapters 4-6). Liverpool also, from the early 1970s, avoided localised frameworks to a large extent, however informal, working to a range of programming mechanisms related to land treatment budgets.

In all of these cities there was a tendency for even informal local plan frameworks to be superseded by mechanisms from within the programme agencies - normally those controlling housing and environmental improvement budgets, and the inner area programmes arising from the inner cities initiatives of 1977-78 onwards. In a number of cities Planning Departments had major roles within (rarely full control of) inner area programme and environmental improvement budgets. These could be used as levers to secure local planning objectives, but whether they were so used would depend on many organisational and political factors. There was no necessary link to spatially aware local planning and so no clear external sign whether the absence of specific frameworks meant the supersession of local planning (by citywide instruments) or just a continuation of local planning by other means. Certainly the new programme and budget roles of planners and the increased overall uncertainty and turbulence from the late 1970s shifted the character of local planning.

There were a variety of responses to this, some closely linked to the planning of inner residential areas and all related to Inner Area Programme mechanisms. One was to give small area budgets to local bodies, normally of councillors and officials, as in Newcastle from 1975. This was not common and the budgets remained small compared with main programme totals. More frequent was the turn to information documents, as with the ward statements progressed from 1979 in Manchester and the inner area studies from 1981 in Birmingham. Though these often aspired to influence

decision making, they were primarily confined to informing inside and outside the council - which might or might not affect local planning decisions in the inner areas for which they were produced.

Whilst parts of the inner areas of the major cities were subject by central government to several new planning instruments in the 1980s, this did not directly affect the older residential areas to such a large extent. The main new mechanisms (Enterprise Zones, Urban Development Corporations, Housing Action Trusts) were directed more to derelict or industrial or recently redeveloped housing areas. Only the Task Forces for coordinating central government department inputs were focused particularly on the districts containing older residential areas. Thus much of the range of 'new planning styles' considered for example by Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) was not present in the areas considered here. These areas continued essentially with the same planning and programming equipment as they had had before 1979 - Task Forces and City Action Teams represented minor exceptions. This is not to say that the policies remained the same, although within the study period, up to 1986, and even up to the time of writing the greater control of public programmes by central government had not moved on significantly to privatisation mechanisms in most of these areas. Inner residential areas were in general left out of the 1980s initiatives - and were at risk of losing through the diversion of resources to the other new programmes and projects.

Overall then one sees a range of links, from occasional statutory plans through informal frameworks to information exercises and methods of networking between officials outside any spatially geared or overtly specified form. The dimensions described here, concerning local planning instruments, content and implementation would in a fuller examination have to be linked to planning process. Until further detailed research has been carried out, it is not possible to specify what these links may have been.

No attempt is made in this section to move towards explanations of the patterns indicated. At this stage it has been sufficient to describe briefly some of the tendencies operating in this local planning context. These have revealed to some degree a common pattern but with a significant range of variation along several dimensions. It is important to understand what has caused this variation; the search for the explanation of these features will begin in Chapter 2.



## **D Research Strategy and Methodology**

### **1. Overall Strategy**

It has been argued that not enough is known about local planning in older, inner residential areas in order to answer questions which may be important for future practice. This will be justified much more fully in Chapter 2, where the planning literature is examined in depth. In particular better understanding of the detailed inter connection of the key dimensions of local planning (content and objectives, instruments, processes and links to implementation) is required. The core of the research strategy is therefore to expand this understanding by intensive study of a small number of cases. As a whole the research strategy adopted consisted of the following elements:-

- (a) an extensive and brief survey of inner area local planning in 12 local authorities, linked to a literature survey, in order to establish the range of experience in the study period (as presented in Chapter 1, Section C);
- (b) a literature survey, in order to establish what explanations of the causation and the effects of various forms of inner area local planning have been proposed (Chapter 2);
- (c) development of a simple framework for analysis, and further consideration of some of the elements of this framework, drawing on recent social theory and urban studies (Chapter 3);
- (d) intensive study of local planning in 2 neighbourhoods in each of 2 cities, to examine the kind of planning undertaken, the factors generating this planning and the impacts on the areas and their residents (Chapters 4, 5 and 6);
- (e) a comparison of data from certain key English local planning experiences, to broaden the sources for possible prescription of new or improved forms (in Chapter 7).

A more theorised treatment of the basis for the research methodology is given in Appendix 3. The key points from that discussion are as follows.

1. It is argued that a greater concentration on intensive than extensive studies in this research is justified by the research questions, which concentrate on how particular processes worked and how they were generated; this point relates to all four research questions, in designing the studies relevant to provide adequate data for fresh consideration.
2. It is argued that a progressive iteration between conceptual and empirical aspects of the research, developing explanatory frameworks in 'conversation' with the empirical analysis, is justified by a 'realist' social science approach. Realism sees the boundary between data and conceptual development as highly permeable and changeable. This is particularly relevant to the first two questions, in establishing what local planning approaches were adopted, how they were 'applied' in each neighbourhood, and how they were caused.
3. It is argued that a broadly realist understanding of causation is appropriate, particularly in relation to the second question. This does not adopt the more narrowly realist conception of generative mechanisms or structures, as this is not regarded as appropriate at the levels at which this study is conducted. To abstract up to structures such as the capitalist mode of production has not proved helpful in undertaking this type of research. Rather, it is argued that the realist rejection of the 'covering law model of causation' (by which, as in closed physical science experiments, if A and B happen, C follows) is appropriate. The development of the explanation of the adoption of local planning approaches relies on a much looser conception of causation, aware of 'structural' and 'contingent' elements, constraining certain situations, facilitating certain forms of action.

## 2. Detailed Methodology

### (a) Selection of Cases

The survey of the dimensions of large city local planning reported in Section C was partly intended to give information which would help the choice of case studies. This choice, as argued by for example Yin (1984) or Massey and Meegan (1984), depends on the research questions asked. Yin (1984 p 18) argues that 'how' and 'why' questions are those most likely to lead to the use of case studies in a research strategy. In this study the requirement was to understand how local planning processes worked in specific instances of the study context and why they worked the way they did. Considerable local detail was required for this purpose and study of several varied instances provides more suggestive insights into local process than focus on just one small area.

The decision to choose areas within two cities was based on the aim of discovering the differences made by varying city-wide approaches to local planning, when applied within differing local contexts. Examining no more than two cities stemmed from the understanding that a comparison between two should reveal the kind of differences made at citywide level; an increase to 3 or 4 cities would not necessarily make the conclusions on processes or mechanisms more conclusive, and, from a pragmatic point of view, would demand more time and resources than would be available.

The number of areas chosen within each city was decided in a similar way, to show a varied range of situations but without demanding excessive amounts of local fieldwork. In practice this suggested 2 or 3 areas within each city. In the same way as at city level, increasing the numbers above this level would be hard to justify, given that the aim was not to compile an extensive set of data on the working out of local planning approaches, but to survey intensively local processes.

The timescale chosen, from 1966 to 1986, was based on the requirement of understanding significant changes within processes, covering more than one 'era' of planning/urban policy intervention. In practice much less primary data was obtained on the period 1966-74, partly because the secondary sources could be

used quite effectively for this period, partly because the difficulty of data collection for this period (due to changing personnel and less surviving or accessible documentation) meant that the return from research time for these years would be low. In addition, although the comparisons with later years are instructive, the contexts have clearly changed so significantly that for the purposes of any more or less immediate prescription, the lessons are less relevant.

The choice of Leeds and Manchester reflected a wish to research cities relatively comparable to my previous work experience in Birmingham, giving some familiarity with the research context. They may be seen as within the same 'league' of larger English cities with a broadly similar municipal government tradition. Some other possibilities such as London Boroughs or Liverpool were avoided because of important differences in history and context or, in the case of Liverpool, because of an arguably unique and hard to research planning experience. Leeds and Manchester on the other hand offered research advantages in terms of helpful contacts within Planning Departments and other agencies, who themselves were interested in local planning issues.

Within the cities two areas, Harehills and Richmond Hill, were selected in Leeds, and two, Gorton North and Moss Side, in Manchester. From initial discussions and observation these areas appeared to contain a range of varied situations, with more local active involvement than others. A further study area in Manchester, Cheetham Hill, was omitted from the final analysis and presentation, as it was decided that it did not add sufficient understanding to that gained in the other two areas.

In terms of case study method (see Yin 1984 pp 48-53) there was an element of "theoretical replication" from one city to another, as the research progressed. That is to say, the research work in Leeds was undertaken first, in a more exploratory form, to move towards useful propositions. The Manchester research was then carried out in a more 'processed' form, with the opportunity taken subsequently to obtain more relevant data in Leeds and further analyse both sets subsequently.

Looking finally at the lowest level of choice of data, particular 'episodes' were focused on. These were relatively discreet local planning situations which, after surveying the main run of local planning in each area, showed up usefully the key factors at work in local planning process; in other words they could be analysed so as to reveal the operation of various localised or non-localised factors. The process of selectivity is unavoidable, given the great number of such situations in any local planning context. This is no more than an extension of the intensive study approach, which is justified by the adequacy of explanation produced, not by the achievement of generalising statements. These episodes might be termed "action-situations" in Bhaskar's terms (1986, page 187) to draw attention to the evident presence of agency at this level and to the features which Bhaskar ascribes to these situations - openness, diversity and historicity. But just referring to episodes or cases localised in place and time, is less uncomfortable and can carry the same weight of contingent, actual events. The specific choice of these episodes will be discussed further during the analysis of cases in Chapters 5 and 6.

(b) Collection of Data

The tasks of data collection did not diverge significantly from those typical in this type of planning study (see for example Healey et al 1985 pp 114-115, 1988, p 261-268), combining secondary published sources, documentation, interviews and direct observation of the areas studied. Firstly secondary published material, by both academics and planning professionals, was surveyed, as well as some unpublished work in the form of students' dissertations. Fieldwork in the cities and areas involved interviews with a range of participants in the planning process, principally planners in the local authority and various local actors, including local politicians, but including some other officials. The main documentary sources were the files of the council departments (primarily Planning and Housing), but local newspapers and other records in local libraries were also examined. These sources were supplemented, as in all planning research, by observation of the physical environment of the areas, a highly significant source of evidence when combined carefully with the other elements.

Again, as in all normal social scientific practice, the aim was to achieve reliability of information, by asking the same questions of different sources, both

in terms of factual accumulation and of judgement of the influence of particular factors in local situations. In this study the combination of interviews with officials in separate departments, with councillors and with local voluntary organisation workers and residents, along with documentary evidence, helped to provide the reliability of multiple sources. Appendices 1 and 2 contain lists of the sources used, which are then referred to by these numbers within the case studies.

(c) Analysis of Data

As described above and in Appendix 3, the data has been through several 'rounds' of analysis, with a successive movement of reinterpretation, in more or less theoretical terms. At different stages of the research varying aspects have been emphasised, depending on the specific form of questions being addressed. The form of 'factorised' analysis in relation to specific elements and periods, presented in Chapters 2 and 3, was the result of a process of iteration between the data, previous analyses and other social scientific sources.

(d) Presentation of Data

The intention in presenting the data in the following sections is to remain relatively close at first to the 'event-form' of the evidence; that is, to use an essentially narrative form for each city and each area, though analytically focused. This combines what Yin (1984 pp 132-133) calls the 'linear analytic' and 'chronological' forms of exposition, the two most straightforward ways to present and analyse evidence. The narrative sections are followed by more analytical treatment. This combination of "story" and "joint explanation" is common and appears normally to serve well (see for example the differing balances of chapters in Healey et al 1988 - Chapters 3 to 6, then Chapters 7 to 10, or in Brindley, Rydin & Stoker 1989 - Chapters 3 to 8, then Chapter 9).

## E Thesis Structure

The next chapter will examine the information on the research questions that can be obtained from existing studies within the planning literature. This leads in to the development of a framework for analysing local planning experience, as discussed in the first part of Chapter 3. Several parts of this framework will also be developed further in Chapter 3, concentrating on the dimensions of variation between neighbourhoods which are seen as likely to have influenced local planning.

The first part of the case studies, in Chapter 4, is concerned with the variation between the overall approaches to local planning in the two cities studied, Leeds and Manchester. This chapter will draw on some of the concepts developed in urban studies in the 1980s.

Then Chapters 5 and 6 will analyse in detail cases and episodes within the neighbourhoods selected, in order to study the extent to which local planning practice, and its outcomes, rested on variations at a very local level or on citywide or higher level forces.

The final chapter summarises the case study conclusions and then examines two other local planning experiences, in order to broaden the field of evidence which can contribute to answering the research questions - especially in terms of prescribing better approaches to designing forms of interest involvement and institutional change. This will be followed by discussion of the implications of recent government housing policy changes, and the final section will propose some desirable ingredients for better local planning in inner residential areas.

**A Introduction****B Analysis of the Generation of Local Planning**

1. Approach
2. Local Planning in General
3. Local Planning in Inner (Older Residential) Areas
  - (a) State Policy - Planning System
  - (b) State Policy - Programmes
  - (c) Planning Profession
  - (d) City Economic Circumstances
  - (e) City Political Circumstances
  - (f) City Organisational Circumstances
  - (g) Neighbourhood based actors
  - (h) Very local spatial/physical configuration
4. Explaining the shifts in local planning approaches

**C Analysis of the effects of local planning - evaluation****D Analysis of the merits of local planning approaches - prescription****E Conclusions**



### A Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine what previous writers have been able to contribute on the central questions considered here. It will be seen that the contribution has been extensive and useful, on aspects of local planning and inner city planning in general, but quite limited, in relation to inner city residential areas in particular.

The central point of the review is to gather together the explanations and generalisations that are available, so that these can be ordered and further theorised where necessary in Chapter 3. At the same time gaps in the treatments will be established, so that these too can be addressed in the next chapter.

The chapter is organised under the main research headings - to understand how local planning approaches were generated, what effects they had, and what improvements have been advocated. The main contributions will be synthesising academic texts of the 1980s, but earlier writers will also feature at particular points, as well as articles by practitioners from the professional literature. First of all then the ideas on how local planning approaches were generated in these contexts will be examined.

### B Analysis of the Generation of Local Planning

#### 1. Approach

In considering how writers have explained local planning approaches, there is a difficulty. This is that much more thought and space has been devoted to local planning in general than to local planning in the major cities or in inner areas; and much more to the last two aspects than to local planning for the older, inner residential areas. If only the last aspect was reviewed, the results would be very limited. On the other hand moving from the other contexts to the most specific one is not always straightforward.

The method adopted here is to give a brief introduction to some general approaches to explaining local planning. This will give an overall background to the shapes of available explanations. This will be followed by discussion of the determinants of inner city local planning, occasionally focusing on older residential areas, but mainly applying the more general comments to these areas by legitimate extension.

What precisely is to be explained? Centrally it is the variation in local planning outlined in Chapter 1. This will be understood as containing two components:

- (1) the overall approach to local planning of the local authority of a particular city;
  - (2) the ways in which local planning is actually carried out in particular local areas.
- Clearly there is a mutual movement of influence between the two components, but each can be subject to differing forms of conditioning.

It will be necessary for explanation to be able to account for key shifts in overall approaches. In addition, if more indirectly, explanations will help to understand the changes in the sorts of planning advocated by practitioners in each period - as will be described in the section on prescription below.

## 2. Local Planning in General

In the 1980s there have been four significant attempts to explain why local planning in England has taken its recent forms. Each has of course influenced the others and so they are not in reality totally distinct. However each will be considered in turn. The discussions will be summary, to give a flavour of explanations rather than exhaustive presentations. It is worth noting that much of what these writers say was already present in discussions in the 1970s. The advantage of these texts lies in their more extensive analysis.

Healey and co-workers have researched the planning system, especially aspects of local planning, throughout the decade, publishing two major texts - Healey (1983) and Healey et al (1988). The first sprang from research on the local plans system, the second from research on the relationship of development planning to development processes, in a number of varying localities. The explanation presented in the later

work is complex. To simplify considerably, the treatment blends ideas on the political economy of land and property development processes with forms of state policy analysis. It thus takes its substantive cue from understanding of the economic contexts of the areas studied, subject to changing spatial divisions of labour and capital investment. Planning responses are then seen as arising within these constraints, within particular bureaucratic and political institutional contexts, under pressure from a range of interests, and using available or inventable instruments to forge suitable policy processes. The explanation is therefore a multi-faceted one, observing how different local agents, especially local planners, could operate or develop the changing planning system. Considerable emphasis is put on the structuring constraints imposed by forces of private (dis)investment and central government policies, though some scope for local initiative and variation is also identified.

A second relatively full explanation is given in Bruton and Nicholson (1987). This arises from extensive work on statutory and non-statutory local planning experience. The essence of their explanation is drawn from management and systems theory. The central idea is that the law of 'requisite variety' suggests that very varied circumstances require very varied responses. As the challenges with which local planning deals are highly diverse, it is appropriate that local planning approaches should be equally diverse. Both central and local government agencies have thus initiated a wide range of arrangements to intervene in land and development processes. Layered on top of this is an insistence on the importance of bargaining and negotiation, in most circumstances. The analysis puts less specific emphasis on the details of development or on institutional - local political processes; these are often seen simply as the local context - to be understood in each case.

A third explanation, referring to the development of planning styles as a whole in localities rather than particularly to local planning, is given in Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989). Their overall framework refers to the economic and political/ideological dimensions within each locality, identifying prosperous, marginal and derelict areas, with market led or market critical political approaches. These dimensions are not seen as dictating the planning response, but as setting typical contexts within which institutional arrangements, forms of political decision making and local pressure operate to condition actual planning policies. The level of analysis is more general than that in the two cases above and is particularly focused on

changes since the early 1980s. But the overall explanation can be applied to an extent to explaining local planning approaches.

The fourth, rather more limited, attempt to explain local planning approaches is in Farnell (1983). This study was based on examination of four cities, essentially on experience in the 1970s. It suggested that local planning was relatively straightforward and effective where 'development' was required by interests with funding, whether private or public. However where more altruistic forms of local planning were attempted, to secure gains for weaker or poorer actors, local planning normally ran into difficulties and was twisted back to a 'development' orientation. Effectively this explanation suggested a linking of the interests of capital and state, drawing on Castells (see Farnell 1983 p 18). Thus there was something like a 'hidden hand', operating in some way through local politics and professional aspirations, encouraging certain objectives in local planning and discouraging others.

Looking at these four explanations together, one can see several connecting threads. All except the last emphasise the variety of approaches generated and see this as related to the local circumstances of each authority or city region. The substantive pressures of development or its absence are stressed, though somewhat less so in Bruton and Nicholson's work. Political and institutional processes are seen by all as significant, though less fully examined by Farnell; Brindley, Rydin and Stoker are strongest on the ideological and local political influences on urban planning. Healey et al and to an extent Brindley, Rydin and Stoker examine the force of interests in each locality. Overall the blend of structural conditioning and local agency given in Healey et al and, in less detail, in Brindley, Rydin and Stoker give the more satisfying explanations of how planning evolved in each area. But all four texts help to build up much of the weight of explanation which is needed to understand local planning approaches. These serve as a backdrop to the more specific explanations to be examined next.

### 3. Local Planning in Inner (Older Residential) Areas

As explained above there is much more treatment of local planning in inner areas generally than that in older, inner residential areas in particular. Therefore here it will be necessary to move from one to the other, with due care and adjustment.

The following method of exposition is used. A preliminary consideration of likely causes, linked with examination of the relevant texts, suggested eight factors which could be seen as conditioning the forms of local planning. These factors are not easy to separate, being in certain respects internally related; that is to say they are in part conceptually mutually interdependent. However they will be treated as separable and here each will be discussed in turn.

Figure 2 summarises how the four key texts examined above saw the operation of these factors. In what follows other writers' positions are brought into the discussion. Of the eight factors the first six contain mixtures of determination between the national level and the city region or local authority area, with the balance varying between each and according to particular circumstances; whilst the last two refer to aspects at the finer grain of district or neighbourhood. Thus the first six may be seen as likely to determine city-wide approaches, whilst the last two may be additionally important in setting the ways local planning is carried out in concrete instances in each local area. Therefore the following discussion of the first six factors will be viewing the effect on both components, whilst for the last two the effects on the second component will be examined. Of course if there is sufficiently general influence from the last two factors then, in the formula used here, they become part of the 'higher level' factors, of city politics in particular. What is distinctive about these two factors is that they are abstracted in such a way that they may be determinant only at a very local level. The relationship between these spatial levels and the abstracting of each factor is evidently something which needs to be discussed - as it will be in the next chapter.

Now each factor is treated in turn.

Figure 2

## FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ADOPTION OF LOCAL PLANNING APPROACHES FOR INNER AREAS

Writers	State policy - planning system	State policy - programmes	Planning profession	City Economic circumstances	City Political circumstances	City Organisational circumstances	Neighbourhood based actors	Neighbourhood spatial/physical configuration
Healey et al	Statutory plans system in some respects not well adapted. No other tools designated for these areas (as against EZs, UDCs, HATS etc for others, or GEAR in Scotland).	Very influential in setting opportunities and especially problems - housing, inner area and other programmes.	Some role though not emphasised.	See as central, in extent of disinvestment and weakness of private sector.	Of some importance in setting varying role for local interests.	Give some attention to changing council bureaucratic form, in facilitating or blocking planning approaches.	Only rarely able to influence effectively in inner areas.	Note primarily importance of multiplicity of ownership and use of land parcels.
Brindley et al	Very influential in setting overall range of available options (but not considering inner residential areas as such).	Aware of important role in all contexts.	Of importance, to varying extent, in all planning styles, most so in council dominated ones.	Of central importance in setting scope for various styles.	Important in forming ideological approach of council.	Inner area cases mainly dealing with other forms of public or semi-public agency, not changing council organisation.	Some influence in contexts where circumstances propitious, but often overridden.	Not touched on.
Bruton et al	Important in statutory plan being inadequate, other initiatives being influential in weakening LA planning, fragmenting.	Central in creating large public role, and creating integration problems, overall complexity, no total approach.	Not directly cited, but the local choice and invention of planners seen as very important.	Absence of pressure seen as important, as well as the volatility of private investment.	Not discussed much but acknowledged as significant part of context - at least council politics (little on movements etc).	Aware of general influence, but not traced through for inner areas in particular.	Not treated from this angle.	Not touched on. Probably seen as too detailed an issue to be analysed.
Farnell	Aware of general nature of system, but not main focus - 4/7/68 system seen as workable for <u>some</u> interests.	Sees as one part of 'development' facilitation.	Planners' ideology seen as very important - aspirations and values.	Other part of 'development' support, lacking in inner city.	Seen as of some importance, though 'hidden hand' effect in all cities.	Chronicles changes towards and away from corporate management approaches in 1970s, and effects on local planning.	Not touched on.	Not touched on.

(a) State Policy - Planning System

The set of planning instruments made available by legislation, and managed by central government officials, has been often identified as important in inner area local planning. Normally the joint machinery of local plan and development control has been seen as negatively constraining or at best not useful. The gradual withdrawal from the use of statutory plans was described in Chapter 1. Articles in the special issue of the professional journal (*The Planner*, eg Perry 1974) were generally confident that the new local plans system was workable. Only one article (Bowen and Yates 1974) considered that major legislative changes, to widen the scope of local authorities planning powers, would be needed. By 1976 there were far more doubters amongst practising planners, with fears that the nature of the instrument, and especially the Department of Environment's interpretation of its use, would reduce the chances of fruitful combination with corporate and community governing (Perry 1976, Fudge 1976, Hambleton 1976).

Much of this concern stemmed from experience or knowledge of planning in inner city areas. By 1979 these areas were seen as specifically unsuitable for statutory plans, unless very radically different use of the instruments was made (Adcock 1979). Although government advice argued that inner city areas were one forum where local plans were especially appropriate (Department of Environment Local Plans Note 1/78), some regional offices at least were it seems already prepared to support looser approaches, as long as a statutory form was proclaimed to be the goal (Adcock 1979). By the early 1980s it was being firmly argued that the nature of the statutory local plan made it unsuitable in inner areas (Wenban Smith 1983), although other instruments could if necessary be changed to statutory form at a later stage. Only in inner London was the opposite tack taken, with Thompson's advocacy of the single statutory plan in Camden (1977) - to be backed up by other tools as required. The relationship to another key part of the planning system, appeals, was given as one major reason; but broadly speaking only inner areas in London experienced such appeals arising from development pressure.

Both the major late 1980s texts saw the statutory plan as of limited value in inner areas. Healey et al (1988) noted that one reason for avoiding statutory form was procedural, internal to the instrument, in that central government aimed to restrict local discretion by limiting the scope and content of plans (p 195). Bruton and Nicholson

(1987) conclude that the statutory plan is "too limited a policy vehicle" (p 177) in general, not just in inner city areas. But they see this as primarily the result of its limitation to land use matters by government policy and due to contextual features, rather than inherent in the instrument itself.

At any rate through much of the period practitioners did identify some inherent difficulties in using the statutory local plan, especially in the limitation on its content and the problems in producing the plan and revising it quickly. Whilst these were seen as applying generally, they could become more acute in inner city areas - as much in older residential zones as elsewhere. Given that the other main urban policy/planning tools of the 1980s (Urban Development Corporations in particular) were not designed for such areas, the fact that the statutory plan was seen increasingly, from the mid 1970s, as having some, at least potential, limitations was significant. The explanations given of this factor's influence are broadly satisfactory, stressing both the nature of the instruments and the way they interlock with other factors.

#### (b) State Policy - Programmes

In addition to the specifically planning instruments the state is responsible for a wide range of public programmes. Some are of course of a general character (social security, health etc); their vital importance for the futures of inner areas was argued fully in for example the Inner Area Studies Reports in 1977 (Department of Environment 1977). Here the focus is rather on the programmes more immediately tied to land use and built environment - the housing, transport, urban programmes for example. These are to a significant extent centrally funded and controlled, although most have elements of municipal control. Whilst there have been to some extent changing and uncertain views as to the importance of planning instruments, a broad spectrum of writers have agreed that the nature and organisation of public programmes and initiatives have been central in affecting local planning approaches, as well as particular local area experience. This has been evident in the early treatments of the late 1960s and early 1970s, in writing by practitioners from 1974 onwards and in the late 1980s texts. Muchnick saw the key problem as one of "the coordination of the policies and activities of the Corporation hierarchies into a uniform redevelopment package" (1970, p 114). That is the relationship of the Planning Department, with its new instrument, and the programme departments was seen as problematic. A new



super agency, Muchnick argued, was needed to plan and programme urban renewal. The discussions of Sunderland and Newcastle by Dennis (1970, 1972) and Davies (1972), whilst not explicitly theorising the role of public programmes, refer constantly to the issue of the comprehensive nature of redevelopment (or in the Rye Hill, Newcastle case, rehabilitation and redevelopment). This was seen as creating such a magnitude of change, over such a long period, that local response was made very hard (Dennis, 1970, pp 348-352). Implicitly then it was the linking of the major public programmes with the planners' plans that set the form of the latter - normally vague and changeable within the broad framework of the development plan, until the point of redevelopment neared.

Similar connections emerged in the analysis of Paris and co-workers in the early 1970s in Birmingham. In Lambert, Paris and Blackaby (1978), it is argued that the redevelopment area study (Chapter 4) showed "the impossibility of planning" (p 88), given the control by other forces of the housebuilding programme - not permitting planners to deliver the promised phased redevelopment. Their other study of an area mainly due for redevelopment (Chapter 6) showed the possibility of completing a plan with residents, but no control over implementation by public programmes:- "'Technical cooperation' with the planners meant influence over the formal content of formal plans ... which once made were virtually redundant" (1978 p 145). Their study of an area 'saved for improvement' (Chapter 5) told the same story of planning not linked to programming. Overall this account was construed in somewhat mechanistic terms derived from aspects of Althusserian Marxism; it saw state policy at both local and central level as necessarily controlling, essentially for the purposes of maintaining class domination. But the analysis of the linking of programmes to planning can stand free of this theoretical interpretation.

The slightly later book on urban renewal policy in the early years of rehabilitation in Birmingham (Paris and Blackaby 1979) adopted a looser understanding of the connection of state policies, market processes and working class housing. But the specific comments on local planning emphasise the idea of a conflict between the different parts of the council responsible for the renewal programme, citing the example of a site in one plan area where the planning department opposed the views of residents, the project team and the environmental department (1979 p 140). The second book is very much more about the overall programmes rather than planning process, reflecting a shift in interest to the forces constructing these programmes. But

in so far as planning was discussed the thread of the conflicts and difficulty in implementing plans was continued.

Mason (1977), in his study of Manchester, saw similar problems in planning for urban renewal areas, with an emphasis on "city-wide departmental goals rather than special, integrated policies for particular areas of the city" (Mason, 1977 p 78). These departmental goals were in turn related to the various sectoral programmes which made up Manchester's renewal efforts.

By the end of the 1970s practitioners were expressing similar opinions on the source of planning difficulties, requiring new approaches. Adcock (1979) considered that the failure to link inner area local plans to firm, short term public spending programmes had made them irrelevant; conversely if tied especially to the new inner area programmes he saw great opportunities for effective local plan making. Wenban-Smith (1983) identified the uncertainty of public spending programmes in the inner areas, which were heavily dependent on such programmes, as one of the main blocks to local planning of a conventional form.

Therefore by the time of writing of the later 1980s texts a quite general opinion and experience could be drawn on. Healey et al (1988) note (pp 177) the very major public sector role in the inner city (in landownership, land assembly/development and in financial/subsidy terms) and conclude that "our research showed clearly that development plan policies have little leverage over public sector development proposals" (p 195). At the same time the public sector is seen as fragmented, emphasising a piecemeal approach via multiple initiatives to any one area (p 77, 79). The cases reported in Chapter 4 of Healey et al (1988) reveal varying links between the local planning process and the public programmes with the funds (on occasion) to implement plans, but in all cases the link was centrally important. Thus in Salford the processes of a corporately operating authority allowed some control to be channelled through the two small area plans analysed, one being for an older residential area; many of the problems in each case equally arose from programming hurdles, particularly uncertainty over public funding (pp 82-88).

In the Manchester study the Local Planning Strategy for the mainly residential area considered "was more a record of investment commitments than a plan to guide future action" (p 90). It was argued that "resources destabilisation" (p 91) in the public

sector was as much a problem as sectoralism. In Birmingham the case study showed similar difficulties of uncertainty or lack of public sector resources for areas dominated by such resources, creating problems of commitment and implementation (p 96). In all cases the nature and level of public programmes were central to the form and effects of local planning.

Bruton and Nicholson (1987) reach similar conclusions. They quote Byrne (1978) on the incompatibility of local plan making and normal public sector programming, drawn from Byrne's experience of plan preparation in Newham (p 154). Thus statutory plans normally limited themselves to already programmed development and very general statements on resources (p 154). In Chapter 5 they consider a wide range of public programmes and initiatives in relation to local planning, several of which specifically apply to inner residential areas. In all cases they note "an explicit separation of structure and local plan proposals from the public sector resources partly necessary for their implementation" (p 227). They observe that many of these "special area policy measures" apply in particular to the inner areas (p 229). The fact that many of the initiatives have "an explicit spatial component" (p 229) is problematic for local planning, which has somehow to integrate this component within its process (or ignore the initiative).

These points are traced out in their Chapter 5 by looking at particular programmes. Housing measures are seen as separated from planning processes. The use of instruments for housing renewal such as GIAs and HAAs is not linked to formal planning documents; in fact government advice has stressed mainly "independence of action taken under housing legislation" (p 183) with plans to reflect rather than control housing renewal proposals. This distinction persisted through successive advice (Circular 13/75, Local Plans Note 1/78, Circular 22/84) from the Department of the Environment, with Local Plans Note 1/78 stressing that non-land use planning activities should not be shown as proposals in Local Plans. "The DoE clearly did not envisage local plans playing a key role in the corporate approach to renewal" (p 183).

A similar conclusion is reached on inner area programmes:- "although IAPs are essentially spatially-oriented investment programmes, they are not formally linked to statutory plans" (p 206). Partnership and Inner Area Programmes have tended to be topic based, continuing sectoral rather than area-oriented tendencies. Bruton and Nicholson note that Wirral's use of local plans in preparing their IAP was fortuitous,

given that they were at an advanced stage when the authority received programme status (p 205). Normally plans have not been linked in to IAPs in this way, with primarily encouragement to "opportunistic or entrepreneurial informal local planning approaches" (p 206).

Many of the informal planning instruments categorised under "special area measures" relate directly to such public programmes and have been extensively used in metropolitan districts (pp 255-256). In Chapter 8 Bruton and Nicholson consider how the public sector has related to local planning in its roles as developer. Their treatment is generalised but applies with considerable force in inner residential areas. Thus they note that the public sector's infrastructure provision role has exhibited relationships between councils and other agencies based on "continuous processes of management" (p353) not on plans - pushing towards informal planning approaches again. Between providers of social and welfare facilities and planners a tendency to sectoralism is again identified. They conclude that "the sectoral organisation of central and local government, backed up by bids for resources on an intra-sector rather than inter-sector basis (eg TPPs, HIPs), must militate against the integration of service provision for local areas - whatever innovations in statutory or informal local planning the local planning authority can offer" (p 358). Overall they identify the "organised complexity of public sector land and development interests" (p 365) as a block to formal planning efforts.

Thus Bruton and Nicholson have dealt extensively with the role of public programmes and identified this as a key fact in conditioning local planning approaches, especially in inner areas. Their work is useful in going rather further into the details of public programmes and initiatives than other writers. Their analysis emphasises the importance of both sectoral biases and special area policy measures, both containing problems for area oriented local planning. In this way they bring together much of the experience of the previous two decades, reaching back to the early study by Muchnick (1970) on the problems that Liverpool's comprehensive redevelopment programme experienced due to the fragmentation of effort amongst council departments. The Inner Area Studies Reports of 1977 contained perhaps the most authoritatively argued case for better coordination of state activities, seeing this a key ingredient for more coherent and responsive local planning (DoE, 1977). Clearly the influence of this factor has been extensively analysed, and in itself adequately so. But there has still been only limited study of how the influence has worked in

particular neighbourhoods, in conjunction with the factors specific to those neighbourhoods.

### (c) Planning Profession

In the explanation of any approaches within town planning, one can expect professional aspirations to have played some role. Analysis of inner area local planning has sometimes seen that role as very important, particularly in the earlier period; recent treatments have stressed the position of these agents less.

Thus the work of Davies (1972) and Dennis (1970, 1972) saw the ideologies and practices of planners as of key importance in conditioning the utopian or comprehensive solutions chosen in redevelopment or rehabilitation schemes. "In Newcastle the paramount power was the Planning Department" (Davies 1972, p 91). And the planners' values of comprehensiveness, modernity, futurism, progress were seen as dominating other possible competing discourses (Davies 1972, p 4). Dennis saw similar problems, with the ideology of planning as the main block to public influence (Dennis, 1972, p 242), and planners claiming technical expertise against the force of electoral democracy.

In retrospect this viewpoint appears to reflect the highpoint of planners' influence within the major state programmes. Later 'managerialist' analysis of inner city change, as reflected to some degree in Lambert, Paris and Blackaby (1978) continued to see the values and roles of public officials as important, but extended this to other professions, seeing planners as only one, often less important, influence.

Farnell (1983) put considerable stress on planners' aspirations as one important element in the potential variation of planning styles. He considers that professional planners were largely responsible for deciding what local plans to prepare, and notes the importance of professional channels in transmitting fashions and aspirations between planners in widely scattered locations (p 39). The aspirations in 1974 of the four councils studied are recorded: for corporately oriented plans based on public participation, entailing extensive programmes of statutory plan making. The experience of the next two years pushed planners towards much more modest objectives, in these as in many other cities. Farnell sees both the initial aspirations and the subsequent revision to more realisable goals as subject to considerable

professional influence. However he modifies this by laying emphasis as well as on more 'structural' features, which he appears to see as lying behind the abandonment, common to all four cities, of the 1974 aspirations. Farnell's work connects with the themes of many professional articles of that period, which were in a sense seeking to reverse the criticisms of Davies and Dennis, but still retain planners in influential roles in community based, corporate planning (eg Bowen and Yates 1974, Hambleton 1976). The subsequent lowering of planners' sights is then reflected in the later 1980s texts.

Thus Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) see planners as least influential in the new planning styles which were spreading into the major cities, and retaining more power in the more 'traditional' trend or regulative planning elsewhere (they are not directly concerned with older inner residential areas). Healey et al (1988) see the actions and attitudes of planners as of some importance, noting for example that the commitment to consultation practices in inner Birmingham and Manchester stemmed partly from "positive attitudes towards public involvement within professional ideology" (p 202). Planners' expertise is seen as of greater importance in certain of the policy processes identified than others - particularly in "techno-rational processes" (pp 229-232). The latter in turn are seen as significant in the inner city cases as are two other processes where planners could be influential - bureaucratic - legal and bargaining (within the public sector). (Table 10.3 p 226). Overall the professional's role is seen as of continuing importance, to some extent substituting for the only marginal expression of many inner area interests (p 91). Implicit in this last possibility is that planners may have had more influence in inner city contexts than elsewhere, given the weakness of external competing interests. However this is not put forward as a firm hypothesis or conclusion in any of the texts considered here.

The planning profession, through its press and organisations, operates to some degree nationally, feeding new approaches into the practices of local practitioners. Viewing the literature there is no doubt that these nationally (or regionally) circulating ideas have been of significance. Particular shifts have sometimes come from influential discussions of practice in one authority (eg Thompson, 1977, affecting other London boroughs), although as often experience has been learnt locally from the hard lessons of practice. From the limited treatment in the studies quoted, it is hard to go beyond these general comments on the influence of the planning professional on local approaches. But one senses that in inner areas planners have had at times

considerable scope for influencing local planning forms, within certain constrained boundaries.

(d) City Economic Circumstances

The general levels of private investment and disinvestment in the major cities, and the levels in particular inner areas, have been widely seen as factors affecting local planning approaches. This aspect came to the fore in the mid and late 1970s with the first gradual then accelerating collapse of much of the traditional industrial base in the larger cities. This collapse affected inner areas particularly, given the location of many of the industrial premises within these areas. The Inner Area Studies published in 1977 (Department of Environment 1977) saw the processes of economic decline as central to the creation of inner city problems. The ensuing inner area initiatives from 1978 onwards were to have considerable effects on inner city local planning practice, though especially for industrial and commercial areas, tending to reduce emphasis on residential areas.

Local planning practitioners started to focus on these circumstances at the beginning of the 1980s. Thus Wenban Smith (1983) argued that it was the absence of private sector development pressures in inner areas which made plans there hard to prepare and implement. Evidently this is the reverse side of the dominance by public sector funding. Farnell (1983) is aware that given the absence of private interest, his 'facilitation of development' thesis refers to public funding in the inner areas (p 32). Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) construct their typology of planning styles in part round the levels of private investment into localities; inner areas are divided between their 'marginal' and 'derelict' areas. Most older inner residential areas probably show features of both, in that they are likely to have at least some private investment in terms of the purchase and occasionally improvement of residential and commercial properties - more so at any rate than some derelict industrial zones or public housing districts. However these writers do not discuss these areas directly in their case studies.

Bruton and Nicholson (1987) see the main role for statutory plans as in areas with development pressures (p 419); although their discussion of local planning and the private sector suggests that volatility of private sector investment creates considerable problems for local planning in all contexts (p 377). They do not devote much space

to considering the effect of cities' economic circumstances. Healey et al (1988) review more explicitly the effects of industrial decline and selective outmigration on local planning opportunities, seeing these as key contextual elements in the inner city. They create areas of decaying industrial buildings and they also increase the poverty of many inner area residents, in turn affecting the interest claims operating in these areas (pp 75-79). Thus at a local level the onus is put on the sometimes hard pressed public sector to implement improvements. At the city-wide level the difficult economic circumstances of many cities during the years studied meant that uncertainty was increased too much for forward planning locally to appear worthwhile; inner city areas seemed to have too intransigent problems for local plans to have any influence on them (p 194).

Thus, these writers are broadly agreed, the economic difficulties of inner cities have made local planning harder and put public investment in the foreground - with the further problems that this has generated already discussed. In addition the overall economic ills of the cities have doubtless contributed to a 'non-planning' climate of opinion which has discouraged formal planning approaches to some extent in all areas. Again then the general thrust of explanation of this factor's influence is adequate but the fuller effects, jointly with other factors, especially on city politics and how these effects were played out within specific neighbourhoods, have been less extensively studied.

#### (d) City Political Circumstances

It is clear that in some respects the political character of a city can influence the nature of local planning undertaken. Strong political forces and movements, particularly those controlling the local authority or authorities, have effects on other factors discussed above - the scale and nature of public programmes, the employment of professional planners, the response to central government initiatives. What is not clear, at least at the outset, is what further effects local political forces have; local planning approaches might even be postulated to be mainly unaffected by such forces. There has been only limited analysis of this factor, restricted mainly to academic research projects.

It is evident that the North-East studies of Davies and Dennis saw council political complexion as of some importance, setting the dominant tone of planning, but they



did not specifically analyse local authority politics. The studies of urban renewal policy in the 1970s (Paris and Blackaby 1979, Mason 1977, Gibson and Langstaff 1982) were more concerned with municipal politics, and the effects of community action, but made less connections to local planning. Farnell devoted some attention to the political complexion of the four councils, concluding that the changes from Labour to Conservative in 1976 did not appear to affect greatly approaches to local planning (1983, p 52); there appeared to be political consensus on these issues, perhaps to be interpreted as political disinterest. However his treatment of the issues within local planning suggests that political circumstances in the cities did affect the substantive directions councils were taking - and hence, on Farnell's own thesis, the forms of local planning.

In the 1980s the heightened political character of much city politics has directed more attention to the differences such local control may make. Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) see the ideological-political positions of local authorities as important in setting the frame for 'market led' or 'market critical' planning styles. Rydin (1986) argues that from economic circumstances one cannot deduce "the organisational form of the planning with its associated institutions, local politics and modes of decision making. To understand the causes linking a style of planning to a particular area, it is necessary to add political and ideological dimensions" (p 5).

Bruton and Nicholson (1987) refer to "local political context" (p 273) as one of many factors influencing the wide variety of non-statutory approaches, but they do not give much attention to political issues. Healey et al (1988) show much more interest. Within inner city policy processes "politico-rational" processes are seen as important, with "consultative" processes also relevant in certain cases, suggesting the influence, to some degree, of political debate and of elected councillors (p 226). The changes within Manchester and Birmingham, including the shift to more open and consultative forms of government which put "paternalist bureaucracy under challenge" (p 200) are seen as important in setting the context of local planning. Similarly Salford as a new authority with strong political leadership and a vigorous planning function was able to undertake local planning of a forceful kind (p 201). All councils are seen as heavily constrained by central government, with controls in the inner city case studies through financial and instrumental instruments (primarily Urban Programme funds) (p 213).

There can be little doubt, from the work of Healey et al in particular, that city politics is one significant factor in setting the overall approach to local planning, but it is hard to generalise about the way the connections operate in the particular context of interest here. Further focusing on these connections and also on the nature of politics in the older inner residential areas can help to progress understanding of this factor.

#### (f) City Organisational Circumstances

Under this heading the prime aim is to consider the effects on local planning approaches of the way local authorities are organised. Clearly councils are not the only significant organisation in this context, but in the period studied they were by far the most important (along with central government). Abstracting this factor separately from city politics or public programmes is doubtless difficult. Both these factors contribute in forming the organisational shape of the councils. However, separate treatment will help to reveal some further connections.

One can schematically identify three forms to which council organisation has tended in the period studied. The first was the classic council 'machine' managing the authority's service and development activities of the 1960s and, in many cities, through the 1970s. This was the object of study in the earlier texts, particularly Davies (1972), Dennis (1970, 1972) and Muchnick (1970). The studies by Healey et al (1988) saw the same features several years later, in Manchester and, to some extent, Birmingham, still identifying strong departmentalism and city-wide procedures of planning and implementation (p 89). Their Manchester case study was particularly revealing of the difficulties this caused for focusing attention on particular areas (pp 89-91). Within these large machines there was always a likelihood that particular areas would be neglected in favour of others, that too much would be taken on, given staff resources - a major factor identified by Davies in Newcastle in the late 1960s (1972, p 155, p 212), with only a few planners responsible for a wide range of programmes.

Lambert, Paris and Blackaby (1978) also highlight the importance of Birmingham's administrative organisation in the early 1970s, seeing control exercised by the "politico-technical partnership" (pp 165-6) of professionalised, departmentalised administration and city-wide party policy determination (p 160). This they saw as reducing the opportunities for local control over planning and hence for effective and

valuable local planning, as they conceived this. Mason's account of Manchester (1977), referred to above, points in the same direction - that this organisational form tended to militate against a genuinely area based local planning approach, whether in the inner areas or elsewhere.

The second form that may be identified was the very variably achieved switch to more corporate forms of management normally from the early 1970s. Whilst most authorities made strong moves in this direction around the time of local government reorganisation, the changes were to last only 2 or 3 years in some cases, with reverses in Leeds and Birmingham in 1976 when Conservatives secured control. Farnell (1983) chronicles these changes (pp 46-48) and argues in his Chapter 5 that the "comprehensive, corporate, community plans" (p 80) attempted in Leeds and Birmingham were linked in their philosophy to these overall organisational changes in the council (as well as to professional aspirations, as outlined above). Arguments in the professional press (eg Fudge 1976, Hambleton 1976) sought to establish the same case for local planning approaches which could link in to authority corporate management systems.

Elements of such systems are identifiable in the practice especially of some of the somewhat smaller inner city (or partly inner city) authorities. Thus Adcock's account (1979) of the Wirral's plans linked to the corporately prepared inner area programmes. Healey et al's (1988) treatment of Salford's relatively corporate structure backing coordinated local planning and Southerton and Noble's (1982) description of Middlesbrough's evolution of a corporate approach to planning its inner districts all bear testimony to the influence of this corporate form on local planning approaches. In all cases some caution is required in assessing how far traditional departmental structuring was overcome - in view of the apparently shortlived boost given to Wirral's corporate approach to local planning (Bruton and Nicholson 1987 p 205 and interviews with Wirral planners by author 1986), and the problems experienced in Salford even in the very small area cases reported in Healey et al.

One feature of organisational form surviving through the study period and which stemmed from the corporate enthusiasms of 1974-75 was the structure of area project teams to implement the urban renewal programme in Birmingham. This was linked to the Planning Department and created a semi-corporate approach to local plan making in the older inner residential areas (see Healey et al pp 92-96). Subsequent

attempts to create coordinating 'Inner Area Studies' in Birmingham, described in Urwin and Wenban Smith (1983), stemmed from the same kind of thinking, though within a relatively traditional departmental framework. As the name suggests this initiative operated more for informative and probing purposes than as a forward planning document, partly because of that departmental framework.

The third organisational form is not so easily labelled, but is intended to identify the typical process evident in the big city authorities from the late 1970s. This was somewhat hybrid, containing elements of both the other forms. Healey et al (1988) give some of the flavour of this period (pp 200-203 in particular), but the local planning texts do not concentrate on this feature; a fuller understanding of internal council structures in more recent years is found in Stoker (1985, 1988). The links to inner area local planning have not been explicitly brought out in the existing literature. It can be suggested that the likely direction of influence is to some degree back to the anti-area orientation of the 'classic machine' form, but modified by the cross-departmental and cross-agency initiatives stimulated by inner area programmes and other political challenges affecting the authorities' modes of operation. Decentralisation initiatives had only made quite limited progress by the end of the study period. Even by 1990 few authorities had been able to complete a comprehensive administrative decentralisation, let alone move to any political devolution of powers. Therefore this set of initiatives will only be treated in the concluding chapter, looking at some post-1986 developments - given its potential in resolving some of the coordination and accountability issues which have dogged inner city local planning.

For the present it has been shown that there have been firm links between the council's organisational form and inner area planning approaches. Recent analysis of these links in specific neighbourhoods however has been confined to Healey et al's studies; there is further scope to examine how council organisational forms have interrelated with other local circumstances.

#### (g) Neighbourhood Based Actors

The main subjects of local planning in this context are the residents, but those who own or work in shops, other small businesses and local public institutions such as schools and social facilities are also liable to express local interests on occasion; it

is their immediate environment which is being planned. A long running and central question has been the extent to which these actors determine local planning processes and their results. As far as the creation of the local planning process is concerned, there is very little evidence or discussion in the literature. Some of the analysis of public participation (eg Batley 1972, Thornley 1977) dealt with related issues, but has normally been couched in general terms, rather than investigated particular older inner residential neighbourhoods. The overall tone of analysis from Davies (1972) and Dennis (1970, 1972) onwards is that local residents (the main actors identified) were normally only able to gain access to and therefore influence the local planning form in exceptional circumstances. Both Davies and Dennis see the cards as heavily stacked against local residents in their studies of the late 1960s, although in both Rye Hill and Millfield residents were, through persistent and knowledgeable pressure, able to change some parts of the councils' plans, opening up the planning process at the same time to some extent. Both writers saw the planners as rationing information and controlling residents in this way. Dennis (1970) analysed blocks to public participation, with part of the explanation being that poor residents in these areas lacked the confidence to control the situation (pp 348-352). Coates and Silburn (1970) were also not hopeful about poor people's ability to create united, powerful vehicles to challenge planners' schemes, from their study of an inner area in Nottingham. "There is more likely to be a conflict, or partial conflict, of interests which will disrupt and fragment any local group which claims to defend the interests of all" (p 243).

Lambert, Paris and Blackaby (1978) also focused on the poverty and class position (in work and income terms) of residents and rarely saw them as able to control local situations - mainly due to "being locality based groups in a situation in which the issues were not limited to, or determined by, the locality" (p 159). The problem was therefore not necessarily that groups could not organise themselves or persist - though in their study of an area chosen by the council for retention (Chapter 5), this was the case. But in the broader sense of local planning, even where (as in their study of an action area, Chapter 6) a local plan was agreed by residents, residents were not able to secure adhesion to the plan. Therefore they did in this case help to set part of the very local planning arrangements, but not enough to secure real control.

The later planning texts are rarely focused at the very local level, perhaps assuming that such local interests were relatively powerless. Only Brindley, Rydin and Stoker

(1989), looking at one case of popular planning in Coin Street, Lambeth, and Healey et al (1988) reporting three case studies, reach down to this level. Their analysis tends to suggest the limited strength of local interests in these inner areas, with the willing support of the councils (in Coin Street, the GLC) necessary elements in any successes. In Healey et al's study of a Manchester local planning exercise the local interests' input was seen as marginal (p 91); in Salford residents were seen as having some degree of influence over what happened but not when it happened (p 86); in Birmingham too local groups were not seen as able to influence outcomes (p 95) - which in all these cases implies an equal inability to control the local planning process in a way that would operate to their advantage.

Indirectly of course one can see the community action of the late 1960s and early 1970s as creating the support amongst councillors and officials for more consultative local planning approaches, as Healey et al note (1988, p 202). This can be seen as operating at both national and city-wide levels. However there has been little detailed study of the process and one is left wondering about the extent of influence and what balance existed between the different interests locally. Healey et al (1988, pp 158, 168-9) observe both the multiplicity of interests and potential clashes within interests, in the inner city. This suggests limits and difficulties in influencing local planning process, emphasised by the limited degree of open debate of policy options observed in the inner city areas (p 236). But it is suggestive rather than conclusive.

It is evident then that there is scope for further study of this factor, both from outside the local planning field where this has useful implications, and in particular contexts.

#### (h) Very Local Spatial/Physical Configuration

In a sense this factor is 'nested' within some of the previous ones, just as that of local actors is influenced by the city's economy and public programmes. However in the same way it is useful to highlight the very local circumstances of areas and query in what way they have affected the way local planning has actually been carried out in particular areas. Along with analysis of very locally based actors one may then be able to identify more local facets of conditioning than a focus solely on the first six factors would allow. The main features identified as of possible significance are the environmental inheritance, in terms of its spatial interrelations and physical character, accompanied by their social, economic and legal dimensions. It is true that

very little analysis of local planning processes has focused on these factors, given the treatment of 'higher level' issues in most studies. Only the cases investigated by Healey et al (1988) looked closely enough at areas to start to see this fine grain. Thus they identify "landownership units and land uses ... fragmented into small parcels, with adjacent activities often causing adverse externality effects for each other" (pp 77-78).

It would seem plausible that the kind of local planning carried out in an area is tailored to some degree to these existing spatial relations; that the existing studies have in the main not suggested this can be attributed to their focus, on the broader forces which they no doubt see as setting the broad frameworks of redevelopment or retention, public or private ownerships and so on. At least once the broad policy towards redevelopment or otherwise is set, it makes sense to see the nature of the existing urban form as having importance, both very locally and more broadly. This need not lead to a fall into a simplistic environmental or physical determinism, especially in view of the multi-causal explanation being explored here. Further consideration would appear to be warranted, from associated fields, as is some attention in the case studies.

Figure 3

## PERIODISATION OF LOCAL PLANNING FOR INNER RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Years	Typical Character	Context
1966 - 72	Strong master planning role (in reality virtually always at least shared with several municipal departments).	Large scale redevelopment schemes, of houses, roads and social/community facilities.
1972 - 78	Strong coordinating role, based round formal or informal local plan, preferably community based.	Large scale rehabilitation schemes for housing areas, reduced roads and social facilities programmes. Force of community action protests.
1978 - 82	Looser corporate role, flexibly linking programmes, including planner's special expertise in inner area and environmental programmes; move away from localised frameworks but still informing and grouping by localities.	More dispersed set of programmes and initiatives, within reduced overall budgets, concern for visible results in shorter timescales. Inner area programmes. Greater private sector support.
1982 - 86	Even more flexible/opportunist role, directly linked to implementation via networking between departments and agencies. No local planning frameworks.	Increased uncertainty in both municipal and national politics and programmes, professional defensiveness, infighting for funds more acute.

Source Full range of local planning literature, as quoted in Chapter 1, Section C and Chapter 2.



#### 4. Explaining the Shifts in Local Planning Approaches

One way of summarising some of the contributions made by the eight factors analysed here is to present a periodisation of local planning and consider how the factors influenced each period. The periodisation is shown in simple terms in Figure 3, based on the planning literature as a whole. This will not amount to a theorising of the factors, but to a simple historical grouping to account for shifts in approaches - that is changes in general approaches rather than in particular local areas.

Thus the first approach, seen as a strong master planning role, may be seen as derived from a set of public programmes (of redevelopment of the inner areas, primarily), based largely on state provision of new facilities, in the major cities. This set of public policies was supported by the ideologies of the planning profession and of leading politicians and, to a large extent, by the relative prosperity of many of the cities and the absence of local challenge to the programmes.

Around 1972 very locally based actors, mainly residents in areas due to be redeveloped, helped to change the planning approach, bolstered by the presence of new planning instruments (the statutory local plan) and city organisational circumstances (corporate planning). The switch in public programmes towards residential rehabilitation at the same time, associated to an extent with a different environmental inheritance, helped to seal the shift to at least new aspirations of local planning. The change was a complex one, coming from general political and ideological changes affecting professionals and politicians, as well as from social movements.

By about 1978 new circumstances on most of the factors, but especially associated with the change in many cities' economic circumstances and the downturn in public programmes, complemented by the introduction of special inner area programmes, all contributed to a shift in planners' aspirations and approaches. The effect was to accelerate the move away from area based frameworks, towards new citywide mechanisms which promoted new policies, although area orientations were often retained in new forms, for information or to record investment decisions.

By the early 1980s even the minimal certainty of this latter phase was being disturbed by further challenges to the political legitimacy of authorities, to their private and

public resource base and to the professional standing of planners, arising in large part from the post 1979 change in government philosophy. Very locally based actors added pressures in the form of riots. The public programmes became even less secure. Under such circumstances authorities became even more reluctant to make binding local commitments, and more opportunist or entrepreneurial planning styles became common in most cities during this period.

The above very brief characterisation naturally skates over many connections and leaves unanswered several central questions about the directions of causation. This is partly due to lack of evidence, particularly on the significance of very local factors - but even on more general factors. There has been no general history of local planning in these years; though much can be gleaned from the texts cited here, they still leave gaps and inconsistencies of treatment which are difficult to bridge.

Furthermore the analysis has remained primarily on the level of the generation of the overall approaches to local planning in inner areas, not to how these approaches actually worked out in specific older, inner residential areas. This has been inevitable given the very limited information on the latter, in the core of the study period. Nevertheless it will be helpful to simply list the typical and generalised role of each factor; this will serve to summarise this section:

- (a) the absence of suitable formalised planning instruments (by legislation and by central government guidance) for older residential areas, in an era without major clearance and affected by the contextual factors further listed here;
- (b) the dependence of these areas mainly on a range of public programmes, often decided sectorally and of declining or unpredictable size, leading to reluctance to make committed plans in advance of funds;
- (c) the somewhat weaker role of planners in these areas compared to that in the redevelopment era, leading to at most coordinating and often secondary positions, except in so far as controlling inner area or environmental funds; nevertheless general influence via profession on specific forms of approaches;
- (d) city economic decline weakening the base of older residential areas in general terms - incomes, commercial and industrial premises (so greater public sector

dependence) - and encouraging general climate of looser planning forms (though specific older areas might remain or become attractive for social, tenorial or ethnic reasons);

- (e) city political turbulence encouraging short term goals and caution, in planning generally and in these areas, though with ideological drives to consultation and involvement pushing towards forms of open government and decentralisation, influencing local planning;
- (f) most cities experimenting with various novel forms around 1974 for older residential areas, linked to broader initiatives on council organisation, succeeded often by retreat to traditional structures in many respects, creating varying options for planning approaches in these areas from one city to another;
- (g) residents seen as mainly with limited influence in these areas, perhaps given commitment in many cities to ruling labour councils and the limited institutionalisation of participatory political forms; but apparently variable to some extent between cities and periods;
- (h) in era of retention of most physical fabric, nature of that fabric, in environmental and legal terms and in spatial organisation, could be influential in limiting plausible planning carried out in these areas (eg mixes of uses, historical significance, urban morphology location).

Viewing the degree of uncertainty in what can be extracted or extrapolated from the literature under some of these headings, there is certainly space for more extensive empirical study of local planning in these areas, as well as further consideration of the factors themselves. The empirical study will particularly emphasise the joint operation of the factors in specific areas, an aspect which has often been weakly developed in the local planning literature as a whole.

## C Analysis of the Effects of Local Planning - Evaluation

The next main research question directs attention to the effects of the presence of particular kinds of local planning. Do these make any difference to what happens in the older inner residential areas? And if so, who has benefitted from this? The questions are without doubt much simpler than the answers or the processes of arriving at answers. Several types of effect can be distinguished in principle: on land allocations, environmental conditions, rates and types of investment, the expressed satisfaction of local residents. In all of these types it is difficult to establish the extent to which local planning has been influential in producing an effect. The first step is to discuss why researching and establishing effects is hard, before looking at what can be said about the effects, and about how those effects are produced.

Before the studies reported in Healey et al (1988), carried out in the early 1980s, there had been no wide ranging survey of the effects of the land use planning system in Britain since Hall et al (1973). Bruton and Nicholson (1987) attribute the limited attention given to exploring and assessing effects partly to the recent operation of the local plans system, partly to the initial concern with plan preparation and partly because "questions of policy implementation are inherently difficult to research" (p 337). Healey (1983) had earlier pinpointed several of the difficulties. One aspect was the enormous variety of planning exercises and contexts. A second was the difficulty of disentangling the policies pursued from the planning frameworks; implementation might follow on perfectly from the plan, but simply reflect policies established in other ways. Also noted were the imprecision of many plan policies, not as simple as say the specific zonings of old style development plans, and the very long timescales (typically 10-20 years) over which relevant implementation occurred (pp 209-211).

As a result of these difficulties it is considered by Bruton and Nicholson, following Healey's argument, that it is essential to examine development processes and how local planning policies influence a range of development interests (p 341). Thus the two texts run more or less in parallel, dividing the analysis between different kinds of public and private sector development interests. Their conclusions are similar, with Bruton and Nicholson summarising that "There are few indications that statutory local plans or informal local planning documents per se are of central concern to 'implementing' agencies in the public or private sectors" (1987, p 395). Can anything

as general be extracted from the literature on local planning in the inner areas?

Broadly the answer emerging is that, since the early 1970s at any rate, the effect of local planning on implementation in inner areas was limited and therefore the outcomes in these areas could only be very loosely connected with these planning activities. However the answer is based on relatively restricted evidence. An answer which could well compete is that no generalisation can be made about how local planning has affected these areas, given the range of variation apparent in local experiences. Such evidence as there is will now be examined, looking first at the studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s, then at the impressions of practitioners, then at the research conducted in the 1980s by Healey et al.

The studies of redevelopment or early rehabilitation schemes reported in the north-east and Birmingham (referred to above) had a critical view of the local planning examined. Davies (1972) and Dennis (1970, 1972) especially saw the actions of the planners, and of public policy processes generally, as antipathetic to public involvement, unresponsive to local residents interests and therefore tending to lead to poor results for those residents. Their concern was more for the process rather than overall outcomes, though Davies notes that after nine years, Rye Hill had just seven fully modernised houses (p 189). Dennis refers to the "disquietude which was the only product of living proposals and plans which came to nothing" (1972, p 239). In these texts it is generally hard to disentangle the local planning role from the overall policies governing slum clearance or residential rehabilitation. But in so far as this is possible, the impression is firmly of a planning involvement that worsened a public process which was damaging overall to those it affected. This would appear to reflect the relatively powerful role of planners in this period, within the inner area redevelopment process.

Lambert, Paris and Blackaby (1978) reach similar conclusions on the disempowering effects of local planning; that is to say that the way in which local planning was carried out failed to allow local residents an effective voice and this resulted in less good quality development and worse environmental conditions than would otherwise have been the case with a more responsive planning process. In their two redevelopment area case studies they note that even where adequate public involvement processes existed, the planners could not secure adhesion to plans agreed; in both areas progress in implementation was extremely slow, with neither the phased

redevelopment in the first area (Chapter 4), nor the action area proposals in the second area (Chapter 6) going ahead according to planning schemes.

It was no doubt experiences of this kind, backed by the attempts to create wide ranging statutory local plans in inner city districts (reported in Farnell, 1983, for Birmingham and Leeds), that led practitioners to conclude that local planning was a highly problematic activity in the context, with or without statutory plans. This was pointed out early on by Bowen and Yates (1974), arguing that "our control over resources is minimal ... The local planner is left merely to coordinate these [grant] allocations in order to minimise the possible resultant confusions" (p 502). The experiences of Adcock (1979) in Wirral, Wenban Smith (1983) in Birmingham, Duerden (1978) and Hayes (1981) in Liverpool, and Mason (1977) in Manchester have already been noted and all express a view that the local planning instruments, especially statutory ones, have great limitations in control - notwithstanding recommendations for getting round these problems. Broadly speaking all these viewpoints (mainly of planning practitioners) are saying that normal local planning approaches, at any rate, are rarely capable of controlling the development processes in these areas. In that case the main effect would be seen to be dissatisfaction amongst local participating interests, rather than a particularly bad or good range of impacts in terms of investment or environment.

The case studies of Healey et al (1988) are somewhat less clear cut in their conclusions, but also tend to emphasise the difficulties of control. In the Salford study it was suggested that the council's organisation and concentration of resources on the small area did allow the local planning activity to secure effects useful to local residents, through more sensitive implementation of the set of proposals (p 85-86). In the Manchester case such relative success was much less evident, given the absence of an adequate council process for securing implementation and the absence or uncertainty of public sector resources (p 91). In Birmingham the case study also takes a relatively pessimistic view of the ability of the plan process to secure implementation, despite certain contextual aspects which potentially favoured success - a more sensitive organisational mechanism, a range of public and private funds and initiatives (p 94-96). These studies, and this text generally, are exceptional in that they seek to address issues of 'distributive bias', that is effects in terms of the way the planning system privileges access or influence by some interests. The interests they see as privileged are not mainly those present in older residential inner areas -

their list primarily contains knowledgeable property owners and developers, certain special industries (particularly agriculture and mineral extraction) as well as some public sector interests and some well organised community and environmental groups (Healey et al 1988 p 197, p 245). The main interests in inner areas, land users rather than developers or investors, - residents, small retailers, small or at most medium sized industrialists - are only occasionally likely to have the knowledge or power to secure their desires; at any rate the inner city case studies do not give much evidence of their strength.

However Healey et al's analysis shows a cautiousness about the way in which this distributive bias can be said to be general. Local contingencies mean that interests in principle disadvantaged by 'the system' (of instruments, institutions and processes) may be able to assert their claims effectively (Healey et al 1988 p 246). This can then account for the kind of conclusion reached by Stoker (1985), though examining the slightly different issues of the success of community groups, in working class areas, in controlling urban renewal changes. Stoker concludes that "despite considerable disadvantages community action groups can compete ... and may win policy outcomes to their benefit" (p 544) - this from a survey of the literature on community action in relation to renewal since the early 1970s. Often, as Stoker suggests, such groups were helped by sympathetic outsiders and changing attitudes amongst councillors and officials - in other words by certain local contingencies.

The general conclusions of Healey (1983), before the studies reported above were carried out, still seem relevant. There it was noted that in redevelopment areas only a small number of development interests were involved and control by internal briefs was normally possible (p 214). After the 'redevelopment era' local plans had probably had little control over councils' own development work, with new initiatives (eg for Housing Action Areas) coming from elsewhere and only meshing in with local plans by accident, reflected in plans not controlled by them (pp 215-216). Similarly with regard to other public sector agencies, there is "a major problem of coordinating the development activities of the public sector and hence of implementing planning policies where such development activities are significant" (p 223) - as in the inner areas. Equally development control by the council is seen as only 'plan-based' to a limited degree (p 219), with private sector agencies at most using plans as base lines for negotiations (p 228). Bruton and Nicholson (1987) echo these conclusions, seeing informal and continuous processes of management with the public sector and

bargaining processes with the private sector as only involving local planning frameworks to a limited extent (p 395-398).

If one takes these overall conclusions and applies them to typical inner city circumstances along with the evidence of the case studies, one then reaches the broad answer stated earlier, on the limited control of local planning in this context. Given the opinions of many practitioners this answer would seem to have some weight, but in view of the limited range of empirical work it would be unwise to accept it as final. Firstly it appears to apply less in the redevelopment period, and it may be that further refining would reveal other periodising distinctions. Secondly the early 1980s case studies reveal variations of influence (very roughly along a spectrum from Salford through Birmingham to Manchester), which may suggest a range of potential, depending on context. Further studies might show certain local planning approaches which have tended to control outcomes more effectively, and therefore which could be said to have had specific distributional effects for different interests involved. Going back to the factors analysed in the last section, one may suggest that it is the combined effect of the local planning approach and the factors applying in each situation which govern the effects of local planning. For example the local planning in the Healey et al (1988) Salford case study was seen as reasonably effective in securing coordinated investment to the benefit of local residents; this was the result of a coherent local plan which meshed successfully with council programming and with political circumstances which favoured the professionals' approach. In the Paris et al Birmingham cases on the other hand the approaches, which sometimes did involve public participation, were not tuned to the political and programming circumstances ruling in Birmingham at that stage, resulting in planning exercises with only weak effects. In all the cases cited the relative weakness of neighbourhood actors contributed towards the frequent ineffectiveness of local planning.

The case studies will therefore need to look at both the overall local planning approaches and the factors at work in each area and situation. The very local circumstances of specific local planning activities are likely to be responsible for part of the range of variation. No studies, since at least the early 1970s, have been designed to look quite this closely at the relationships between specific areas and local planning approaches. The studies reported later start with the possible answers given here, tilted towards the understanding that local planning frameworks in the older, inner residential areas had great difficulties in controlling implementation, due to the



lack of leverage over both public sector programmes and the limited, small scale private sector activity, in the core years 1974-86. However the need to incorporate more subtle variation around institutional and local interests dimensions is already suggested by aspects of the early 1980s studies. Hence a very local focus would appear to be justified.

#### **D Analysis of the Merits of Local Planning Approaches - Prescription**

It was clear in the last section that local planning was often not achieving its aims. An awareness of this situation has generated much debate since the early 1970s, with arguments that approaches, or overall contexts, or both, were at fault. Writers in or near to planning practice have especially emphasised prescription, being keen to promote their own view of the most suitable planning approach for inner areas (never as specific as older residential inner areas). Academics have been less enthusiastic in recommending specific approaches, being more conscious of the very wide range of situations and possible goals with which practitioners may be faced. This is perhaps to be expected, as practitioners are reaching conclusions in the main from their own areas' experiences, rather than from a wide range of contexts. At any rate it is useful to separate out the two groups, even though of course some writers are not classified simply in this way.

From the mid 1970s there were perhaps three periods of enthusiasm amongst practitioners in expounding desirable approaches to local planning. The first was not always specifically directed to inner areas, though these were often the main reference point. Bowen and Yates (1974) recommended "district planning (and district budgeting) as the principal instrument managing a corporate approach with a better understanding of problems locality by locality" (p 502). Hambleton saw the possibility of unifying local planning and area management" in one approach which combines the planning and implementation of all policies affecting the area" (1976, p 177). He hoped for local plans of a much broader type, looking towards the 'total approach' of corporate planning advocates in the early 1970s (1986 p 179). Mason, from his study of Manchester, recommended a local corporate 'planning' team to produce a detailed local plan "to transform the local planning process from a limited land use and inter-departmental liaison exercise into a process of social planning and

local participation" (1977, p88). Here therefore writers advocated changing city organisational circumstances and the way programmes were managed, and promoting the position of neighbourhood actors in the process.

The general failure of such "comprehensive, corporate, community" approaches to materialise set the tone for the second set of prescriptions, which were linked primarily to attempts to join the inner area programmes (and other public programmes) to continuous, informal local planning exercises. This was to a degree advocated by Liverpool planners from the mid 1970s (Duerden 1978, Hayes 1981). The clearest advocates were Adcock (1979) and Wenban-Smith (1983). The gap in years shows clearly between the two, with Adcock still recommending formal, possibly statutory, local plans, as against the normally informal linking to programmes suggested for Birmingham - and carried out in the city's Inner Area Studies. The Birmingham system was intended to involve all the relevant public agencies in an annually revised district based planning exercise, including close consultation with local interests. The possibility of putting some of the more land use oriented elements into statutory plans was not discounted, (it was felt this could be done easily and quickly), but this was not the main emphasis of the proposal.

The third group of articles arising from practice sprang from the somewhat distinct political climate of the mid-1980s, mainly from London. From the London Borough of Newham Best and Bowser (1986) advocated an up-dated form of community based planning, following their experience in carrying out a 'Social Audit' for a Local Plan. Rather like Birmingham's Studies this was intended to involve a wide range of agencies, with land use elements extracted afterwards for the Local Plan, but the extra factor was a more extensive commitment to the involvement of a wide range of groups identified as disadvantaged. The Community Action Plans in Lewisham (Goring and Revill 1987) looked in the same direction, though with a more conventional system of public involvement. The innovation was said to stem from the conclusion of the council in 1983 that "the statutory local plan system was neither responsive nor relevant to the needs of local people" (1987 p 63). GLC influenced exercises such as the People's Plan for North Woolwich (Brownill 1988) explored similar issues, in this case related to a 'people's plan' rather than a local authority controlled exercise (though with the strategic planning authority, the GLC, heavily involved). The decentralisation of local authority planning advocated by some (eg Burns 1988) pushed in the same direction, building on the experience or proposals of

several inner London boroughs. The justification for the decentralisation of the planning service was presented partly in terms of getting a closer understanding of local needs, which could be built into local plan work (Burns 1988 p 6), helped by local integration with other services. As one form of institutional change it linked to the range of possible options, from public involvement within an unchanged authority structure to 'people's plans' prepared beyond the council's immediate reach. Although with radical aspirations for local control, these approaches in reality were often working on more limited ground than those recommended earlier, given the smaller extent of most public programmes. In particular less attention was normally being directed to the older residential inner areas and so there was less possible investment, less public initiatives, to which planning exercises might relate. Nevertheless, the aspiration for a greater local say, especially for those seen as previously systematically excluded (particularly women and members of black communities), represented a development of some aspects of earlier prescriptions. These practitioners were effectively arguing for change in many of the factors analysed earlier, especially in the structure and operation of councils, in the forms of planmaking, the position of neighbourhood actors and in the range and objectives of public programmes.

As noted earlier, the recommendations arising from academic investigations are generally rather less specific. Bruton and Nicholson (1987) mainly emphasise the use of a suitable variety of approaches to fit local contexts. In the inner areas they see the conditions most appropriate to statutory plan making as unlikely to apply; here they consider that informal plans to direct or review public spending programmes are more likely to be helpful (p 143). The "linked social, economic and environmental issues affecting the inner city" (p 418) are seen as a "wicked problem", with no consensus over goals or solutions, requiring more opportunist approaches, and initiatives to offset decline, involving means such as development briefs, promotional and publicity documents (p 419).

Healey (1983) discussed the possibilities of some form of community management of land and premises, in supporting 'consumption activities' (pp 277-279), putting less emphasis on the specifics of particular local planning frameworks. In the inner city context Healey et al (1988) limit themselves to arguing for "a more coordinated, accountable and locally sensitive approach to managing the very considerable environmental changes being experienced in inner city areas" (p 98), citing the Birmingham and Newham approaches as providing interesting possibilities. Though

not discounting the values of statutory plans, they therefore also tend to incline towards the exploration of informal approaches, involving a range of local interests, in inner areas. Their general suggestions for more accountability, especially in each part of the public sector, limits on central government powers, the provision of public rights of challenge and the fostering of variety in policies, instruments and institutional arrangements (p 259) point in the same direction, with slightly more substantive content than the advocacy of variety of Bruton and Nicholson.

Thus practitioners have in each period suggested specific approaches to inner area local planning, though never directed to the issues specific to older residential areas; whilst academics have mainly limited themselves to calls for a suitable variety of approaches, probably non-statutory. Both groups are responding to their understanding of the factors which have conditioned the generation of local planning approaches and the way these have worked out in practice. Practitioners have emphasised especially the advantages of changing council organisation and programme management to permit neighbourhood actors greater control. Naturally the more extensive academic investigations have seen a broader range of circumstances and factors at work; this fuller grasp of varied contexts has tended to condition their prescriptions. This conditioning would appear to be correct. What is required though is a further refining and detailing of the understanding of the local planning experience in this inner area context, particularly its very local dimensions; on this basis more specific prescription, or ranges of prescriptions, can be ventured, giving richer indications of the approaches which will favour redistributive and empowering strategies for those based in these areas.

## E Conclusions

In this chapter it has been shown that there exists a fairly extensive basis of research describing the experience of local planning in general and, to a somewhat lesser extent, of local planning in inner city areas. Particularly since the early 1970s there has been little specific concentration on older residential areas (the studies reported in Healey et al 1988 being exceptions), and therefore conclusions on the specific role of local planning in these areas have generally been extended from those on inner areas as a whole.

At this stage the factors identified as generating different approaches have been left in a relatively 'raw' state, to be further considered in the next chapter. The review of how far local planning frameworks had been held to influence local outcomes suggested a tendency to emphasise the weakness of this influence and the difficulties of implementation. But it was argued that this conclusion might be due to insufficient empirical studies and inadequate emphasis on the very local contexts of planning - features which would also weaken conclusions on the relative importance of the factors analysed in response to the first of the main research questions.

It has therefore been argued that there is a need for further empirical study of local planning in this specific context, focused especially at the neighbourhood level. This could then begin to give a firmer foundation for prescriptions, beyond the time and place specificities of practitioners' advocacy and the rather generalised, though appropriate, conclusions in recent academic texts. In order to provide a framework for such further empirical study, it will be necessary in the next chapter to carry out two main tasks. The first will be to consider the factors analysed earlier in terms of a more coherent model or framework for explanation. Then aspects of some of these factors will be developed, drawing on recent social theory or urban studies literature. These will provide instruments for moving on to the analysis of the case studies.

**A    Introduction**

**B    Analytical Frameworks**

1.    Approaches to Social Explanation
2.    Spatial Levels
3.    A Two Stage Analytical Framework

**C    Further Facets of Explanatory Factors**

1.    Professionals
2.    City and Locality Explanations
3.    Neighbourhood Based Social Relations
4.    Neighbourhood Spatial/Physical Circumstances

**D    Conclusions**

### A      Introduction

In order to be able to analyse the case studies, it is now necessary to develop the framework which was used in the last chapter. This will be done here in two ways. Firstly the factors discussed above will be slightly re-arranged, to provide a two stage analytical framework, the first stage facilitating explanation for the approach to local planning in each city, the second extending this downwards to analyse the way planning was carried out in each neighbourhood and situation. Secondly several of the factors will be discussed further, introducing concepts or analyses which will be of use in the case studies.

### B      Analytical Frameworks

Early in Chapter 2 four local planning texts were examined, and it was concluded that, using differing analytical approaches, each was able to give insights into the nature and formation of local planning variety. Aspects of each of these frameworks were drawn on in the 'factorised' approach used for consideration of the literature in Chapter 2. However, as none of these texts (or other sources within the literature surveyed) contained analytical forms designed specifically for the task proposed here, it is necessary to create a framework suitable for the purpose.

It is now argued that the same factors as those used in Chapter 2 can be the basis for analysis of the case studies, working in two stages. In essence it is proposed that six of these factors can be seen as creating the approach to local planning in a city, and that two additional factors at neighbourhood level contribute towards the actual local planning practice in each area and around each issues. This will be described further in section B.3.

The justification for using such a simple framework rests on three main arguments. The first is that an extensive range of influences operates on the formation of local planning and that any reduction to uni- or bi-causal explanation will be inadequate, and misleading for prescription. In their different ways each of the recent texts has

made this point, especially the very complex framework of Healey et al. The latter text is particularly keen to emphasise that it is the joint and interrelated operation of several causal processes which conditions planning process and outcome.

Secondly it is argued that, whilst an awareness of 'higher' level mechanisms can sometimes be useful, it is more helpful to operate at this middle level of analysis when interpreting empirical data. This is based on a view, outlined in the next section (B1), that current social theory is not sufficiently developed to be able to treat the 'higher' level mechanisms adequately. Not only is there a quite generalised uncertainty as to what the structuring mechanisms are, whether of capital, state, gender, culture, etc, but there are even more disagreements as to how these may be seen to work together; the debate within geography/urban studies reported in "Society and Space" journal in December 1987 was a testimony of this uncertainty.

In the next section a very broad position with regard to structure and agency, and some important structures, is presented; this supports arguments for both the importance of structuring forces and the role of agency and contingency, in any concrete situation. This understanding best supports the 'many factors' approach adopted here, rather than any attempted balancing of, say, state, capital and civil society. The disadvantage exists that it will be more risky to conclude the study with powerful recommendations about how these structures should change. But more modest prescriptions on how each factor might change are possible, and one can still point 'upwards' to more general mechanisms.

Thirdly, the framework rests on an understanding of how spatial levels are to be treated in analysis of local planning. This is a matter of appreciating the importance of forces which operate in neighbourhoods or cities, without reifying these forces into objects beyond what powers them. It is an issue which is complex and hard to discuss. It is tackled in section B.2.

Overall the framework stems from a theoretical position (as described in Appendix 3) which may be described as modest or low level realism. This is not easy to distinguish from a weak empiricism, or eclecticism. But the understandings presented below, gained from the richness of social theorising in the last twenty years, separate it from these positions. It can be argued that much useful work within the urban studies field (for example that by Brindley, Rydin and Stoker, 1989, or Duncan and



Goodwin, 1988, or some contributions in Cooke, 1989) is in practice based on the same understandings, even though outside their empirical work writers sometimes propose more ambitious frameworks. Discussion of social explanation and spatial levels will now be followed by a more detailed treatment of the framework proposed.

### 1. Approaches to Social Explanation

At the most general level it is considered that the characterisations of structure and agency presented in Bhaskar's 'transformational model of social activity' (Bhaskar 1986 p 122) or Giddens's structurationist approach (eg Giddens 1979) catch the right balance between 'overtotalising' theory and excessively voluntarist or individualist explanations. Given that Bhaskar and Giddens put rather different emphases on the extent of structuring forces, this may seem too broad a stance to take. But such a position appears to be justified, given the very wide range of situations which social theory may wish to explain. Sometimes a strongly structured explanation will be appropriate, sometimes not, depending on the context and purposes of analysis.

When one moves 'down' a level and considers which structures or agents are best focused upon, again a very broad position is taken. The relationships between the different spheres of society - the political, economic and social or cultural - are seen in the late 1980s by many analysts as both hard to pin down and historically and geographically variable. There have been no firm successors to the solidity of more fundamentalist marxist analysis, with the gradual movements through Althusserian, 'neo-marxist' and 'post-marxist' thinking showing no signs of a conclusive destination - nor that they will necessarily lead back to some form of explanation similar to those of Weber, Durkheim or other major, earlier theorists.

My own understanding of the limits of current theorising can be best presented by very simple comments on general structuring mechanisms in Britain in the study period:-

- (a) that in the study period capitalist structures or mechanisms remained centrally important in influencing social change in Britain; this goes some way to support Harvey's generalisations about capitalist urban development (eg Harvey 1989), and work such as that by Massey (1984) or Duncan and Goodwin (1988) on the uneven development and transformation of the British spatial economy;

- (b) that the British state in this period was both strongly influenced by its social-economic location and also had a degree of autonomous dynamic of its own; this reflects the views of many political scientists in recent years that neither 'capital logic' nor 'free floating' explanations of state actions are convincing (eg see Dunleavy and O'Leary 1987 on state theories generally);
- (c) that 'civil society' and 'culture' also possessed their own to a degree separately constituted contribution to political and social change, but that tying down how that contribution has linked to the motors of economic change or to state forms and processes is extraordinarily difficult, from all the evidence of attempts so far, for example in the debates on class, gender and race.

Here the framework retains the traditional three way split of the economic, political and social, despite its weaknesses. For example the overall tone of Frankel's arguments (1983, 1987) is supported, that 'civil society' is a highly problematic concept, continually infused by and infusing the 'political' and 'economic', and that 'the state' is simultaneously political, economic and cultural in most of its manifestations. However, given the absence of more adequate conceptual equipment, it seems preferable to retain the relatively comprehensible terms used, however variably, for many years.

The framework presented below therefore does not seek to identify fundamental structures, least of all argue that one structure (say the mode of production, or systems of gender relations, or state forms) is the prime mover for the phenomenon to be explained. It remains at a less abstracted level, with a view to identifying more specific influences. When the stage of suggesting improvements is reached, proposals may point up towards aspects of more abstract mechanisms, but the analysis will not operate at that level.

## 2. Spatial Levels

It helps to distinguish three types of 'levels' which are relevant here. One is the level or organisation of the local authority or other public or state bodies. The second is the level at which the effects of 'localities' may be seen to be operative - this may be at any spatial level - global, city region, neighbourhood etc. The third is the

'level' at which abstraction is carried out - this may be very 'high' if one is referring to a very general mechanism or structure, or much closer to specific, concrete instances.

For the purposes of this study the aim is to analyse the effects of the 'locality' level for each city (taken to be the local authority area, but with an awareness that this often relates only loosely to the 'real' city), and for each neighbourhood. Duncan and Goodwin (1988) have recently summed up much of the debate on the relationship of 'society and space', which deals with this issue of spatial levels, and some of their discussion will be helpful for the case studies.

They start from a 'realist' philosophical position, rejecting the cases for both an absolute or 'container' view of space, purely determined by social and natural forces, or the opposite view of space as an objective force in itself. Rather they quote Sayer's position that "space makes a difference, but only in terms of the particular causal powers and liabilities constituting it. Conversely, what kind of effects are produced by causal mechanisms depends inter alia on the form of the conditions in which they are situated". (Sayer 1985a, 52 quoted in Duncan and Goodwin 1988 p 55). Concrete research can then discover the contingent circumstances of the operation of causal powers.

Duncan and Goodwin go on to make a three way division in the forms of spatial variation that they see as possible. These are 'contingent local variations', where general mechanisms happen to vary between areas, 'causal local processes', where generative mechanisms are locally specific, and 'locality effects' where a set of locally derived processes produces some sort of coherent local social system (Duncan and Goodwin pp 59-61).

All these kinds of variation may be significant, at whatever spatial level is being considered as 'local' - in this case at both city and very local (district, neighbourhood, street) level. The point then is to see both where the factors derive their force from and how they interrelate at the spatial level being considered. Duncan and Goodwin also point out the "artificial distinction between general and local" (1988 p 56). This arises from the confusion between levels of abstraction and spatial levels discussed above; a mechanism or structure (say a gendering system or process of capital accumulation) may be abstracted as general, but must in reality occur in specific

places and be affected by the contingencies of those places.

When referring therefore to 'national, city, neighbourhood' levels, one is in fact referring to the derivation and combination of forces specific to each level. In any one case there are likely to be 'contingently varying' general forces as well as 'causally local' ones at work, together. Duncan & Goodwin give one example in the 'inner city problem', which may be viewed as a result of changes in the international division of labour; but also at the same time "national (British) and local (city-level) histories, cultures and social forms have their own significance in specifying such processes and mediating them in particular ways" (1988 p 53). In fact one might equally go down to the level of each inner city district, to see the very different forms the issue has taken within particular cities. It is interesting to note that Urry, at work on the English 'locality studies', identifies ten distinct kinds of "local(ity) effects" (1987 pp 442-443). In fact all of these can be seen to be variants of the three effects suggested by Duncan & Goodwin. But it is significant that there can appear to be so many distinctions, as these may certainly be felt as a wide range of differing effects by people in localities and researchers alike.

### 3. A Two Stage Analytical Framework

The local planning approach at the level of the city is seen as formed by the action of the six more general factors. It is not possible to say in general what state of which factors causes a particular local planning approach, as the explanation would have to be different, normally, for each dimension of local planning. That is to say, for example, the processes involved in local planning may sometimes vary systematically with the form of instrument or the content of the planning, but this cannot be relied upon. In the case studies it will be necessary to examine how the factors affect the local planning as a whole, including each of the dimensions, so as to see in each case how the interrelations are structured.

Nevertheless it will be helpful here to examine how the factors may be seen as determining one of the dimensions (the greater or lesser use of spatial frameworks), at the authority-wide level. After this, the analysis is extended downwards, in a second stage, to present its operation in the concrete case of local planning practice - again without claiming to have one explanation which will be valid across a range of cases and for each of the dimensions. However it will be useful to look at the

varying states of the factors which may affect two particular dimensions - situations which may reinforce the tendency against formalised planmaking, or situations which can create processes more favourable to local residents' interests.

#### Using the Framework to Explain the Use/Non Use of Plans

The main force of the six more general factors has been to discourage the use of one of the main instruments available, statutory local plans, and of all more formalised frameworks. The forms of the factors were:-

- (a) the difficulties in the statutory plan instrument;
- (b) the decline and transformation of state programmes relevant to these areas;
- (c) the increasingly 'opportunistic' stance within the planning profession;
- (d) the private disinvestment/limited new investment in these areas;
- (e) the defensive and conflictual character of city politics;
- (f) the shifts from or absence of community or corporate organisational forms.

But there has been sufficient variation within these factors to lead to a range of experience in the instruments used in local planning. This range is presented in simplified form in Figure 4. Taking the analyses in previous chapters together it may be suggested that the main factors behind the variations between columns are as follows:-

Column 1: more private development pressure in significant parts of the authority, often combined with favourable professional and political attitudes to statutory plan making.

Column 2: political complexion and public programmes giving priority to inner older residential areas, normally combined with favourable professional attitudes to area based frameworks; private development pressure more limited.

Column 3: less public programme/political support for inner older residential areas,

with unfavourable professional attitudes to plan making and very little private development pressure.

These differences are therefore seen as the result of variation in the five factors (the first, national planning instruments, being normally more invariant across the country). This interpretation is, it is considered, consistent with the evidence in Chapters 1 and 2. It also accords with the model presented of spatial levels and abstraction, which allows both some contingent variation, in each locality, of the broader forces of capital and state and some causal variation from local economic and political (bureaucratic, party and movement) forces; that is to say it also allows that some parts of these forces were relatively generalised too.

Figure 4

**USE OR NON-USE OF LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORKS IN  
SELECTED LARGER ENGLISH CITIES**

1.	2.	3.
Main Emphasis on Statutory Local Plans	Main Emphasis on Informal Planning Frameworks	Main Emphasis via ad hoc non-spatially oriented devices and networks
London Boroughs	Sheffield	Liverpool
Salford	Birmingham	Manchester (except city centre plan, and a few inner area initiatives)
Leicester	Leeds (inner areas)	
Leeds (outer areas and city centre)	Newcastle	
	Wirral	

Note Applies to core of research period, 1974-86, but with variations within the period and within each authority.

Sources See text Chapter 1 Section C and Chapter 2 passim.

Moving on to the second stage of explanation, the local planning approach derived from the first stage is seen as replacing the first factor: the way in which the city council conceives of local planning overall then becomes one element in what happens in each area. But the other five factors still have their effects in each area, and in each case or situation, and they are supplemented by more local factors, summarised here under the two categories of social relations and physical/spatial characteristics.

The manner and extent to which these factors can be regarded as 'neighbourhood based' is of course contentious. Many debates about poverty, community and locality have addressed this issue, especially in the last 20 years. Here it is acknowledged that 'neighbourhood social relations' are formed by general factors within economic, social and political life; the point of isolating them as a factor at a very localised level is to emphasise that where spatially specific issues (such as environmental change) are concerned, their localised variation can be seen, very plausibly, to have effects on those issues. The same, in a slightly different way, applies to physical/spatial characteristics; these are a layering of historical accretions derived from the action of general economic, social and political forces. They are however formed into unique configurations in unique places, which can then have continuing effects within further 'rounds' of environmental change.

One can give examples of how this level of the framework could affect certain dimensions of local planning practice. Thus the general tendency away from formalised frameworks for areas may be hypothesised as being normally confirmed or emphasised by local factors - by the lack of local pressure which might have encouraged local planmaking and by the small scale and complex nature of much of the spatial and physical change in most of these areas since the late 1970s. But by the same token the nature of the spatial challenges (perhaps with larger areas requiring decisions) and/or the degree of local organisation may occasionally have pushed the other way and encouraged planners to consider or progress local frameworks of some kind.

One can propose in a similar way that the operation of these factors at neighbourhood level has generally worked against the chance of local residents influencing environmental change to their advantage. But each of the factors has varied on

occasion in ways that have been more beneficial for neighbourhood interests. In the most general terms it can be suggested that this would have been the case when:-

- (i) public programmes were at significant levels, but not set within a monolithic municipal machine;
- (ii) professional planners were inclined to work at 'street level', and were supported by other public or voluntary sector workers within the neighbourhood concerned;
- (iii) there was not strong private sector economic pressure on the area;
- (iv) city politics favoured open debates on issues, influenced by social movements and/or by electoral competition;
- (v) some elements of corporate or decentralised organisation existed in the council;
- (vi) local actors have been able to organise to create pressure on councillors and officials;
- (vii) physical and spatial change in the neighbourhood has been significant enough to be worth controlling and manageable enough to be controllable.

Clearly there is much more that could be said on each of these suggested lines of effect. Some contributions from recent social theorising will be presented in the next section, which will fill out some of the points. But the main consideration of how the factors have worked will be in the localised case studies in Chapters 5 and 6.



## C Further Facets of Explanatory Factors

Little or nothing will be added to the discussion of several of the factors. Clearly this is not because there is a lack of material that could be drawn on to analyse say public programmes or council organisation forms, but because the contribution from the literature in Chapter 2 was sufficient for the purposes of this study. Most of the section will discuss city and locality explanations and neighbourhood level issues.

### 1. Professionals

Though the case studies will not focus closely on the role of particular planners, it is useful to be aware of some of the academic discussion of the role of professionals. There were changes in the 1970s and 1980s in the nature of 'local officialdom' in the planning field. This was analysed by Stoker (1985, 1988), noting that junior officials in decentralised offices or with local area responsibilities could develop loyalty to particular areas which would influence local planning in specific and localised ways (1985, pp 441-444). The extent and form of this influence would depend on the extent of commitment to decentralisation in the council, and in the area concerned. Typically, Stoker suggests, "area staff face cross-cutting pressures, being answerable to the centre and also facing demands from local residents. They react by developing a middleman role, attempting to keep a foot in both camps" (1985, p 441). These 'street level bureaucrats' are seen in the US literature quoted by Ham and Hill (1984 pp 136-142) as able, to an extent, to make policy. Though the contexts analysed were different from those treated here, the judgement can be seen as at least an important possibility in the English inner city planning situation.

The influence of such local officials would not necessarily be limited to the local authority, with a range of bodies developing local orientations in the 1970s and 1980s, including many housing associations, 'voluntary' community organisations often funded by the council and more established bases such as churches. Together and in combination with the 'street level bureaucrats', these very locally oriented forces could exercise considerable influence, within the constraints of their employment, funding and particular ideological understandings. Thus within the mainly public sector institutions connecting to inner city planning one can see that actors not directly 'rooted' inside local areas might well have effects on local planning approaches and results.

## 2. City and Locality Explanations

The circumstances of city politics and economics are seen here as important in influencing local planning approaches, and they also reach down into each neighbourhood. There have been several attempts in the 1980s to explain the processes at work in particular cities or 'localities'. The analysis in Chapter 4 will be supported by the use of ideas from some of these studies. Brief treatment will be given here of the following: the major research programme on seven localities, examining a range of political and economic factors in each (Cooke 1989); Duncan and Goodwin's account (1988) of 'The Local State and Uneven Development'; Harvey's essays, mainly from US experience, on the structuring of city politics (especially 1989 Chapter 5); and Stoker's studies (1985, 1988) of local government politics.

The main theme selected by Cooke (1989 Chapters 1 and 9) is how and why localities can become 'pro-active', mobilising local forces in their own interest. This focus, he argues, moves "beyond the purely structural" (1989 p 11) although "powerful structural forces" exist side by side with the "distinctive development profiles" arising from the combinations of locally specific features, whether economic, social, political or cultural" (1989, p 31). The powerful structural forces are seen as mainly in the national labour market - a prime focus of the research project. The dependence of the northern cities especially on public expenditure is also seen as centrally important, adding to the 'two nations' phenomenon.

Those carrying out the seven locality studies put variable stress on the abilities of 'localities' to exercise 'pro-active capacity'. Those looking at the 'northern cities' (Middlesbrough, south-west Birmingham, outer Liverpool) tended to emphasise structural constraints. Perhaps the clearest expressions of the balance typically arrived at by the researchers are in the Thanet and Swindon studies. In Thanet a particularly disorganised local politics, founded on small businesses, meant that no broad spatial coalition existed to promote the area's interests; there were "political as well as economic impediments to restructuring" (Cooke ed 1989, p 196). In Swindon it was concluded that "pro-active capacity should not, however, be thought of as some form of independent ability of local policy or interests to achieve their goals. It reflects, rather, a specific combination of local factors and wider context" (Cooke ed 1989 p

82). The scope for the council's action was set to a major extent by broader structural forces, mainly by Swindon's position in relation to the south-east regional economy.

These case studies thus show a subtle appreciation of the interrelation of local agency and structural position, which can be seen as matching the emphasis in the model proposed above. That the research teams differed significantly in the degree to which they had faith in local 'pro-active capacity' reflects the major role of broader political viewpoints, as well as the real differences in the cases examined. The conditioning of the scope for autonomous local action will be one theme as well in the case studies reported here.

Duncan and Goodwin's case studies are much less extensive; the special interest is the way they analyse the "combination between particular spatial divisions of labour, civil society and imagined communities in producing a particular spatial division of the state with distinctive local policies" (1988 p 78). By looking at all these aspects, including the 'social relations' within civil society and the cultural and ideological features of imagined communities, they build up a multi-faceted picture of the creation of localities; although they, like the research teams just noted, put most emphasis on the uneven development of capitalism, especially on labour markets as the link through to civil society and politics. Their work on Sheffield for example (Duncan and Goodwin 1985) exemplifies their 'social relations' approach, seeing class and 'consumption sector' (eg housing tenure) changes creating shifts in Sheffield's municipal politics. Other aspects of local social and cultural circumstances, such as gender and ethnic relations, are also likely to be important in such analysis, as has begun to be evident in some recent treatments of Labour city politics (Gyford 1985, Wainwright 1987). As a shorthand formula Duncan and Goodwin's idea of the creation of local politics by the other three spheres is useful and shows the considerable flexibility evident in what may be described as a 'neo-marxist' text. The 'local state' (effectively the local council) is seen as a potentially independent agent, as well as a servant of central government. Again the balance of structure and agency is evident, within a multiply conditioned explanation.

Harvey's explanatory model is ultimately much more unitary, stressing the forces of capital accumulation and devaluation as the motor behind city politics. Such a universal theory seems to be 'overtotalising', even though its explanatory power in

many situations is considerable. What is most attractive about Harvey's picture of urban politics is his linking of the 'structured coherence' of urban regions (derived, as in the British studies above all from labour markets) to the formation of city class alliances. Such alliances are not just or even mainly within local government. "It is ... the interpenetration of class, group and individual relations within and between the state and civil society which provides the matrix of possibilities for building a ruling coalition" (1989 p 153). Harvey's analysis of such US urban alliances is highly nuanced, stressing especially the importance of social and physical infrastructures in an urban region's success chances and the role of coalitions in building these. The idea has been taken up by other writers (eg Pickvance 1985, Bassett 1986) and reflected in the studies reported above. No doubt application to British circumstances would see the local authorities as more central actors, but the emphasis on other interests is also valuable. Especially in the 1970s and 1980s an appreciation of the importance of 'new urban social movements' is relevant in British cities (as described in Lowe 1986, for example). New forms of class alliances can be seen as emerging, with the classic municipal socialist model superseded by the 'local socialism' of the 1980s (see Gyford 1985, Wainwright 1987). As long as a too 'economistic' analysis can be avoided Harvey's conceptual approach can be useful for explaining British urban politics.

Stoker's presentation of local interest group politics can be related to the new forms of municipal politics in the 1980s (Stoker 1988 Chapter 5 and also his study of urban renewal in one Manchester neighbourhood 1985). His main argument is that such politics has 'opened out' in the 1970s and 1980s, to include a wider range of groups in more continuous and fruitful interaction with councils; although he accepts that exclusionary biases remain and that some areas have changed much more from an 'elitist' to a 'pluralist' position than others. The areas he identifies as most changed are precisely the urban areas of most interest in this study, though he notes the difference between left and right Labour authorities in the extent to which different kinds of groups have been helped (1989 p 125). The emphasis is similar to that of Gyford (1986), who stresses the diversity and sectionalism facing local government. This 'activation' of local group politics is seen as then creating tensions and new processes within the council itself. Both these analyses are useful in understanding recent political changes in the English cities and how these may have affected local planning.

Overall these four sources add to the ways in which the model presented earlier can be related to particular situations. They are broadly complementary in providing concepts and forms of analysis (structurally conditioned local agency, local spatial divisions, urban political alliances, 'opened out' local political diversity) which bolster the model of national and city economic and political determination. They point to looser forms of class alliances, often affected by urban social movements of various types, which have pushed councils to open out their political and organisational processes. These may be seen in turn as having tended to give more scope to neighbourhood based actors, within more open local planning approaches.

### 3. Neighbourhood Based Social Relations

It was suggested above that one condition which could help actors (primarily residents) gain from local planning efforts would be that they exercise some pressure, particularly on councillors and officials. This is hardly a surprising idea; the questions it raises relate to the way in which these actors see their interests and how far they have developed actions in the 1970s and 1980s to secure these interests. Broadly this connects to the community action and neighbourhood orientation of the 'urban social movements', and to the 'osmosis' (to use Lowe's term - 1986) of these movements into political parties.

Here two aspects of these changes are touched on. Firstly it is suggested that the changes in the interest 'bases' in inner areas have led to some degree of organisation and pressure, first more from class and 'consumption sector' bases (in the 1970s struggles against redevelopment for example) and later more from the energies rising from gender and ethnicity bases (including efforts to secure play and other social facilities, and also riots). However it is noted that this pressure has been far from consistently strong. Secondly some of the changes within community action and local politics are analysed; these have clearly influenced some of the practice of local planning, first in a greater 'community' orientation in the 1970s, then through some of the themes of 'local socialism' in the 1980s.

#### (a) Inner Area Neighbourhood Interests

Strictly speaking, as Healey et al (1988, Chapter 7) have argued, it is preferable to discuss 'interests' rather than 'actors', as the 'activation' of particular interests is

often a key issue in itself. How people understand their own interests or those of others is a highly problematic question, which despite recent attempts at resolution (see Healey et al 1988 p 169-171, Hajer 1988 p 73-74) does not appear to be convincingly resolved. Here reference is simply to the different influences on actors' perceptions of their interests and how these may lead to some sort of community action or participation in "micropolitics". These actions have fed into both the conventional institutions of electoral democracy and professional bureaucracies and into a wide range of newer consultative and participatory mechanisms. The latter have emerged, it has been argued, because the traditional institutions were "insufficiently fine-grained to respond to the variety of interests being expressed at the local level" (Gyford 1986 p 109).

It is suggested that the main influences on actors' understanding of their interests stem from class (with consumption sector), gender and ethnic bases. These naturally work in combination and may often pull in contradictory directions, one of the main reasons for non-participation. The effect of each facet on local planning is, as suggested in Chapter 2, by no means well documented, especially so for gender and ethnicity. Here only brief indications of the topics will be given. More extensive suggestions and references are given as supporting material in Appendix 4.

Before looking at these "interest bases", some general comments on the form of 'community' in these inner areas will help to set the context. It has been held for a long time that "for many, but not all, social groups ... social networks are becoming less locality-bound and less close-knit" (Bell & Newby 1971, p 53). Willmott has suggested that in inner areas community was becoming less 'local', moving away from the traditional bases of solidarity and local interaction, formed from kinship, long residence and limited mobility. He saw this as due to the weakening of the extended family, the changing role of women, increased car use and differential out-migration (Willmott 1981). He recognised that there might nevertheless be strong bonds within ethnic groups, and it seems likely that many inner older residential areas are now characterised by a range of community types, from the fairly traditionally based to the more 'modern' or 'middle class' kind formed more by choice and cemented by deliberate organisation and the use of particular social skills. The latter is linked to the spread of owner occupation in the older areas, a central change of the period from the 1960s onwards; as Eyles (1985 p 79) comments, "the commodification of places makes the quest for community extremely problematic". To pursue the

bases of this apparently fragmented and uncertain 'community', we will look at the influences of class and consumption sector, gender and ethnicity.

(b) Class, Consumption Sector, Gender and Ethnicity

The debates on the social bases of consciousness and action have continued to dominate sociology in particular since the 1950s, without leading to any conclusive destination. The view is taken here that the widening of the discussion to include a range of more 'cultural' dimensions, beyond that of income or class position in some simpler economic sense, has been fruitful. This has been particularly important in the analysis of gender, which has only obtained any firm academic footing in the 1980s. But the understanding of the complex relations of consumption (see for example Dunleavy, 1986, and Saunders, 1986) and, especially for inner city studies, of ethnic relations, have also been significant. In conformity with the preference for remaining with middle level causal explanation argued above, it is proposed that the most useful stance at present is to regard each of these bases of action as partially autonomous. This is no doubt a convenience of analysis in the face of great complexities, but a suitable one.

It is suggested here that changes in each of these bases, during the recent period being studied, have had effects which have tended to lead to greater community involvement and connecting to local planning concerns - though this has been a varying and often weak tendency. Thus class and consumption sector changes in inner residential areas have, through overall rising incomes and increasing levels of owner occupation, led to opposition to redevelopment and, particularly in 'cross-class' or partly 'gentrified' areas, to more organised concern about environmental issues. The rise of 'community action' since the late 1960s within these areas, however variably, is testimony in part to this process.

Partly separate from this tendency has been the greater involvement of women in such informal politics (argued for example by Bondi and Peake in Little, Peake and Richardson ed 1988). On the one hand the traditional leading role of women in 'domestic' and 'community' issues weakened involvement in local planning, as men's normally greater external political activism often disregarded these issues. But where women did become involved, almost certainly more so from the early 1970s (see eg Mayo 1977), a range of issues were tackled in new ways. Thus the 'gendering' of

issues restricted pressure, unless women, or men with changed conceptions of local needs, adopted sufficiently effective and continuing stances to affect the more formal channels of council or extra-council politics. Very often the inertia effects were greater than those which entered the political arena; but on occasions changes could stem from changing local gender relations.

Finally the ethnic turbulence evident in the English inner cities especially from the 1960s has led also to new forms of pressure on local planning. As with gender relations this has been contradictory, in that often, and especially in the early years of settlement, the effect was to cause inaction rather than action. But especially since the 1981 riots greater notice has been taken of the complex range of 'black' or ethnic communities affected by local planning. This has doubtless favoured the most organised interests such as Asian businesses and religious centres but has spilled over, especially through Urban Programme funding, to most ethnic groups.

From these brief comments it will be clear that a simple one-way increase in pressure from these bases is not proposed. It is equally important to try to identify where any of these interests have led to decreased organisation or involvement. The suggestion is simply that empirical research should take some notice of these elements in viewing the local social relations involved in local planning.

### (c) Community and Party Politics

The combined effects of these pressures on local party and community activity will now be considered. This will serve to summarise the kind of 'micro-politics' in which local planning was inserted during this period, elaborating and sometimes modifying the picture of powerlessness suggested by the analysis in Chapter 2 and typical commentaries in the 1980s. For example the judgement of Croft and Beresford was that "most 'community initiatives' have a very small and limited involvement that tends to be biased against poor people and others facing particular discrimination" (1988 p 82). Though perhaps jaundiced, this view would probably be accepted by many community workers and local planners.

The local electoral organisation of party politics has permitted, if not required, some responsiveness to small area needs, but this has varied considerably with a number of factors. The main ones are the extent of intra-party activity, the presence of inter-



party competition and the general level of political or civic consciousness amongst the population of the ward. All three have tended to increase in recent years, especially it seems since the late 1970s, with the coming of the new radicalism in right and left wing politics and the rise of the Alliance parties challenging both main parties. The result seems to have been, in many of the big cities and including many inner city areas, greater participation in ward party activities (at least in Labour and the Alliance parties), more outgoing party behaviour - broadsheets, leafleting, occasional campaigns, especially around 'community issues', and higher voting turnouts (noticeable certainly in Birmingham and Manchester). This contrasts with the stereotype of the 'old urban politics', where there was very limited ward activity, with perhaps a handful of activists in each ward, little or no public activity and (even) lower electoral participation. This is the picture given for example by Hindess (1971) and Green (1974), emphasising particularly the decline of activity in working class and inner city areas.

However, it is not very clear how far these stereotypes can be applied to all kinds of inner areas. One may assume that they are appropriate in 'gentrified' areas such as some London Boroughs, but where there has been a changing working class the picture is less definite. Probably there has been some greater ward participation, but the main changes in many of these areas may be in the other two factors - greater turnouts and greater inter-party competition.

Gyford (1985) tends to characterise this change as a response to the new kinds of social relations appearing in the big cities; this may be so in a few places, especially London boroughs, where race and gender questions have high salience, but it is unlikely to be the case to the same degree in most cities, at least in most wards. In most places it is probable that a fairly old set of social relations creates the main agenda, from class and sector questions, with a leavening of ethnicity in a number of cities, in many wards.

Very broadly then one may suggest that in the period 1966-86 there could be three kinds of 'local political conjuncture'. The first, up to the mid or late 1970s might be the 'traditional' style of urban politics - low activity, class/sector based, low responsiveness; this might have applied to nearly all inner areas.

The second and third kinds, during the later part of the period, would be similar in

their greater degree of activity and responsiveness, but would vary in their connection to 'new' social relations; some wards in some cities would be particularly likely, for the Labour Party, to have different understandings of race and gender from the majority of areas.

Some general connections to local planning can then be traced through. The implications would be that in the first type the ruling (normally Labour) party would expect only a general assent and limited involvement at the local level and local planning would be organised at a high level, through a fairly remote bureaucracy. Community action constituted the challenge to this situation. The second and third types then saw a much greater concentration on detailed issues, projects for particular groups, the 'area politicking' of recent urban programming, creating a more interest-related and politicised planning and implementation process, with each councillor seeking local resources. The difference between the two later types would simply be the styles and issues of politics, of a new or more traditional kind.

Given the scarcity of studies of the connection of local level politics and local planning this picture is speculative, but it does agree with overall indications from the work of Stoker (1985) and, for the early period, some of the classic local studies of urban renewal.

It is clear that community action and party have been closely connected. Green (1974) identified the prime cause of the emergence of community action as the system of "ossified and unresponsive local government". But later one can observe what Lowe (1986) described as the 'osmosis' of activists from community action (and other movements) into party politics, fuelling the 'local socialism' (and to a degree other local politics) of the 1980s. Thus there has been a persistent tendency for the relatively strong municipal government in Britain to divert attention away from community level politics compared with in the USA (Cochrane 1986). This has meant the likelihood of 'incorporation' of community groups, in some degree, whether by the sort of voluntary organisation funding common in English city councils after 1978 or by more subtle council-group interaction.

One may periodise the effects of community action, in simple terms. In the first, from the late 1960s to around 1975, one sees the heyday of community action, seemingly able to make significant achievements in most of the large cities, mainly

by stopping housing redevelopment and road schemes, but also by encouraging councils to reform their clearance programmes. The hard edge of urban renewal and local planning was blunted, as far as older residential areas were concerned, and a more consultative form of process was being created. Naturally this was not purely locally caused - one cannot say quite what national-local dialectic operated, how far funds simply ran out and so on. But local action mattered to some degree. The form of organisation matched the needs of the time - action groups responding to public projects, residents' groups trying to control local change.

In the second half of the 1970s some of the same tendencies continued. Finance was still available in most big cities for a wide range of projects (one or two Conservative controlled cities were rather different) and community action continued at a significant level, diversifying its interests to new issues as well as responding to the new public programmes of housing and environmental improvement. Local planning was very variable between cities, partly because of different experiences in different cities with neighbourhood responses to planning in the early or mid 1970s. However actions became rather more defensive as programmes started to be cut. Small area influences perhaps became less as less general public funding flowed into the areas; broader city-wide alliances or initiatives were more common.

In the 1980s community action declined to a yet lower level, reflecting the difficulties of achieving successes, and local activities tended more towards projects than neighbourhoods. 'Community involvement' was the appropriate term, not 'community action'. This involvement was supported by councils by funding groups, and the councils and voluntary bodies tended to be drawn together by the widespread conflict between central government and local authorities in the 1980s. The exception to the decline of activity was the increase in the most disorganised and explosive form, of riots, and this had a strong neighbourhood and district dimension, tending to keep the locations of rioting in the public eye and so award them some possible power. This affected urban renewal and planning for these areas, stimulating further a consultative style and a concentration on new ways of merging local work and area improvements, though without much funding to back the consultations. Areas without riots no doubt suffered in comparison, with less renewal or planning attention and little special funding.

If one looks back to the periodising of local planning shown in Figure 3, it is not

difficult to detect the influence of the 'classic' period of community action of the early 1970s, in the years 1972-78. The fact that the later social movement and 'local socialism' pressures of the 1980s are not reflected in the later periods is the result of the generally difficult climate for local planning in this period (because of central government policies post 1979), the lesser success in organising in inner areas (riots were in these years more visible and effective) and probably also the extent of 'incorporation' of many of the pressures via public funding initiatives. But these neighbourhood-based pressures have had some effect on local planning practice in certain localities, particularly in London. The history surveyed here points to both general weakness and moments of influence, on the part of actors in these inner residential areas.

#### 4. Neighbourhood Spatial/Physical Circumstances

It is evident that the presence or absence of particular environmental elements is caused, in most senses, by broader societal mechanisms. But local physical and spatial relations can have a contingent importance in terms of the changes that are possible, under specified circumstances. If for example only a few parts of an area are being redeveloped, this imposes clear physical and spatial constraints on the changes that are then feasible - even if these may still be much lesser constraints than are assumed to exist by most of the actors involved.

For expositional purposes one can abstract the physical nature of parts of the built environment and distinguish this from the spatial relations between these parts. These spatial relations are then in reality relations between socio-economic-political facets of the built environment. Neither of these abstracted aspects has been addressed academically in ways which are very helpful for analysis. Here only a few pointers will be selected on each.

One analysis relevant to both the physical and spatial facets and retaining some interest, is the investigation of 'Urban Decay' by Medhurst & Perry Lewis (1969). In many respects this account, with its systems analysis and neo-classical economic orientation, is simplistic. Its advantage is that it did start to look closely at the processes affecting individual buildings or groups of buildings; several different kinds of 'obsolescence' were identified generating different processes of 'decay' (1969 p 61-66). These were connected indirectly to the original character of building in the

nineteenth century in the areas surveyed in Manchester. The importance of area and building adjacency is stressed, in decay processes (1969 p 65). There are clear dangers of naive physical or functional determinism in this treatment, but nevertheless some of the emphases on very local influences are interesting and have been little pursued since, amidst an understandable emphasis on broader socio-economic processes and political or policy analysis.

In terms of environmental production, it helps to distinguish between the major land users, (houses, industry, shops, roads, community facilities, to make a simplified division), as each of these have differing types of provision (and of course many sub-types). One way of analysing this provision has been proposed by Ball (1986a, b), following on his dissection of the structures of provision of houses (1983). He suggests that a similar approach to that used for housing would be appropriate for other environmental elements. He sees this as essentially an organising device, which reminds analysts to include a wide range of features of the provision process, involving all inputs to the system for producing, acquiring and consuming the element in question. Housing analysts for example should be aware of how the housebuilding industry works, of the private and public financial systems for housing and of the mechanics of the land market for housing. The same would go, suitably modified, for analysis of industrial premises or retail development or roads. The point emphasised here is that this approach encourages a relatively simple and physical division of the local environment, as well as use of a device which can on occasions help to organise explanatory data. Though Ball's 'provision thesis' has been criticised (Kemeny 1987), this is more a substantive disagreement about the emphasis on production rather than consumption processes in the housing field than a critique of the quite limited use suggested here.

There is of course more to environmental change than initial physical provision and a further dimension is needed, related to the use and meanings attaching to buildings and local environment. This has perhaps been touched most closely by the urban design and conservation field. It connects to what might be called 'cultural analysis', in which the different perceptions and practices of actors is seen to condition environmental change (see, in a tangential form, Williams 1973, 1981, and Banion and Stubbs 1986 on the gender relations of housing use). The different cultural practices stemming from varying ethnic backgrounds give this a particularly obvious edge in many inner city areas. The process of adapting or reusing existing environmental

elements is thus determined by a range of features, starting with the nature of the historical inheritance and modified by a multiplicity of factors affecting provision and use.

The relationships between these elements have been analysed mainly through the welfare economics language of 'spatial externalities' (see for example Harvey 1971, Badcock 1984). This retains considerable value at this very local level, if one takes it as involving no more than the spatial arrangement of interrelationships. Very much of the substance of local planning practice can be seen as entailing response to an adjustment of these externality effects. These must be seen as involving the full range of concrete facets of any environmental element such as a building or road - the form of legal (and other) rights of different interests to the element and its socio-economic insertion; just to see some abstracted physical relation would make little sense. One can then extend this understanding to typical spatial relations, of externalities, between two elements and the forces which structure their provision. For example there might be a proposal for the widening of a (public) road next to a terrace of owner occupied housing and a block of tenanted private shops. The externality effects already existing and those generated by the proposal could then be analysed, shedding light on many of the circumstances affecting this local planning situation.

Though recently little analysed in these terms, these ideas will be of some use in the case studies when the specific circumstances of sites, schemes and plans are under consideration.

## **D Conclusions**

A simple 'stepped' analytical framework has been presented, composed of the factors introduced in Chapter 2. Several of these factors have been analysed further, in order to give more conceptual equipment for the case studies.

From the analysis it is evident that each of the factors can be seen as containing several key dimensions. For example professional planners would need to be seen in terms of how far they were locally based and whether there were other 'local social professionals' with whom they might ally in a particular area. Key dimensions of city politics would be the form of class alliance controlling the council and the nature of social movements. In each neighbourhood the extent of activism around the identified interest bases would be analysed, examining the implications for community action and electoral politics. The way in which environmental elements (housing, shops et) interacted would be examined, identifying externality effects and the implications of these for planning options. In the case studies analysis will not always proceed in precisely these terms or on these dimensions. But the discussion has provided a set of ways of looking at the cities and neighbourhoods which will permeate the analysis as a whole.

**A Introduction**

**B City Profiles**

**C Leeds - Local Planning Approaches**

**D Manchester - Local Planning Approaches**

**E Conclusions**



## CHAPTER 4      LOCAL PLANNING APPROACHES IN LEEDS AND MANCHESTER

### A      Introduction

As argued already, the need for further empirical research stems from the limited extent of evidence on the way local planning has been carried out in the study context. The case studies will explore the factors which have facilitated and constrained various forms of local planning. This will contribute to an understanding of the circumstances under which neighbourhood actors can influence local planning in their areas. This chapter will start this process by analysing the formation of the two city level approaches to local planning. In these ways the scene will be set for the area studies to be presented in Chapters 5 and 6.

The main focus of this study, as has been explained in the last chapter, is on the working out of planning processes in small neighbourhoods. However this is clearly affected by the approaches at the city level. The formation of these approaches therefore needs to be studied first. Only a general outline of these approaches and how they were formed is required; this was obtained through the use of secondary sources and a limited number of interviews. The outline will be presented for each city followed by a comparative summary of the significant factors involved in each case. This will work with the analytical framework proposed in Chapter 3. That analytical framework suggested a set of forces which overall militated against formal plan making. But the specific, to a degree 'causal' (in Duncan and Goodwin's terms) variation between cities created differing tendencies to formalised planning in each city.

There is no doubt that a complex of features of a city's history build up to a degree distinctive styles of local government and local civil society, which may endure to an extent over decades. Such a tendency to some aspects of continuity can be discerned for example in the collection of essays on British cities in Gordon (1986) and, perhaps less reliably given the risk of 'city loyal' explanations, in individual city histories such as that on Leeds edited by Fraser (1980) or that on Birmingham by Smith and Sutcliffe (1974). Such city styles are founded on a mixture of inherited understandings, traditions, about the role of city government and other institutional processes, and the current nature of political coalitions and ideological assumptions

in effective control; the importance of 'hegemonic projects' is stressed by Hajer (1988), showing how there may often be major elements of local agreement across and beyond parties on most issues facing councils.

These issues of the style of a city council, and of city 'hegemonic projects' in relation to different possible class or spatial coalitions (as discussed in Chapter 3), both have importance in relation to the adoption of particular local planning approaches. They serve as reminders that local planning is not in any respect isolated from overall economic social and political circumstances.

Before describing what the local planning approaches were, therefore, it will be useful to give a profile of the nature of each city in economic, social and political terms. This will reveal some degree of difference, in that the cities experienced different kinds of economic distress, were ruled by different kinds of 'class alliance' during the study period, and were influenced variably by developing social movements. Figures 9 and 10 show the changing socio-economic characteristics and municipal control in each city.

## **B City Profiles**

### **Leeds**

Leeds local authority is distinct from most of the larger English cities in having changed its area dramatically in 1974<sup>1</sup> (here footnotes are placed at the beginning of each section to indicate the sources used; the footnotes are grouped at the end of the chapter). Before 1974 the city had a population of just under half a million, having gradually annexed further land during the century, but by the 1960s a large part of its area was covered with urban development. The city had a mixed class character, from a varied employment base and a large service sector. Fraser (1980) argues that "Divisions within the working class were always as important as the gulf between it and the middle class". Although there were large factories and an organised trade union movement, "Leeds was more a town of respectable artisan than industrial proletariat" (Fraser 1980). As a result it never became a radical Labour city like Bradford or Sheffield, with both a middle-of-the-road Labour party normally in power

and an active Conservative party waiting in the wings for occasional periods of council control (between 1945 and 1974, just in 1951-53 and 1967-72). After the Second World War the city lacked major ethnic divisions, the earlier Jewish and East European immigrations having been absorbed eventually into local social and political life; in the 1950s a significant West Indian settlement took place, followed by Asians in the 1960s, but this seems to have had little socio-political impact until the 1980s.

After 1974 the new council covered a population of over 700,000 - about two-thirds corresponding to the old Leeds County Borough area, the built up area (see Map 1). Beyond this area was a large ring of countryside with several freestanding towns including much of the established commuter belt of the city. The boundaries were no doubt drawn in 1972 with the hope that Conservatives could control the council more often. Certainly until 1980 Labour was unable to obtain overall control, with Conservative majorities from 1976 to 1979 and significant Liberal representation compared with before 1974. So to some extent the same political pattern has continued with a relatively moderate Labour Party and active Conservative, and now Liberal parties. The Conservatives have been able to put forward fairly radical right wing policies, as in fact they had done in the late 1960s with their policy of council house sales; the administrations of the late 1970s were held up as models of right wing performance, keeping spending extremely low and promoting sales of council assets. Since 1980 on the other hand Labour have kept a low profile, continuing the generally 'mixed economy' tendencies of Leeds politics although with concessions to newly organised social forces.

These forces are based partly on the Labour Party's membership which in the 1980s was apparently mainly white collar public sector - teachers, community workers, planners and so on (Perrigo 1986). However there was a split between the District Party's orientation and that of the councillors. Perrigo argues "There is a thin veneer of radicalism but underneath it the structures and practices remain very much as they were before, serving to conserve power in the hands of a predominantly white, male elite". The balance of forces offers power to the council leader, who has his base in public sector trade unionism and the modern council estates of East Leeds. The trade union movement, never very strong in Leeds and not tied in to the party in the same way as Sheffield or Bradford, has probably had a declining influence on council politics during the last two decades, as its manufacturing industry membership has declined.

The continuing strength of Liberals and Conservatives reflects the growth of the private service sector, the decline in the manual working class with the severe industrial collapse from the late 1970s and the persistently prosperous facets of the local economy even in the 1980s (see Figure 9 for some of the changes in the 1970s). In 1981 65% of the city's jobs were in services, the majority being in the private sector. The changing balance is shown by figures for manufacturing decline of 22,000 jobs and services increase of 1,600 jobs, from 1977 to 1981 (1981 Census of Employment). The height of Labour electoral success was in 1980, with a majority of 25 seats; by 1986 this was down to only 7. Sectoral splits are quite apparent as well, with a steady increase in owner occupation from 38% in 1961 to 47% in 1971 to 54% in 1981, as against 27% council owned in 1961 and about 35% in both 1971 and 1986 (with an increase and then decline, through sales, between these dates).

At the same time however one could start to see the impact of changing ethnic and gender relations. Spurred partly by an active women's movement in the city and perhaps to some degree by Liberal activism on 'community' issues, the Labour Party started to emphasise women's employment and child care projects from about 1982 (as is revealed by an examination of Urban Programme documents in the 1980s, see Appendix 1 L7). National ideological changes were thus transferred downwards through both movement and party politics. Some of the accepted conventions of gender roles, whether they stemmed from traditional cultural attitudes, male trade unionism or local business interests, began to be questioned, across a range of local issues. (see Perrigo 1986).

By the 1980s about one fifth of the population of the pre 1974 council, effectively the built up area, were of immigrant origin (this estimate and the following figures are from Faith in Leeds 1986 - L14), but this includes Jewish, Irish, East European as well as Afro-Caribbean and Asian groups. The latter groups on the other hand constituted about 38,000 in 1981, about half being from India, Pakistan or Bangladesh and 11,000 being Afro-Caribbean. These groups were quite concentrated, over half being in four wards around the north and east sides of the inner city, and by 1981 well established - over half were UK born. In the 1980s although only about 5% of the city's population, they had begun to make themselves felt, through the riots in Chapeltown in 1981, the involvement in Labour politics and the cultural activity of many small organisations. Evidently though the proportion numerically remains small,

and the economic and political power still apparently slight.

One can argue that Leeds, in spite of varying council control and political/ideological differences amongst the party elite, has been dominated throughout the period by a cross class alliance generally supporting the city's economic development and 'modernisation'. This judgement is based on the accounts quoted in Footnote 1, especially that of Fraser and Wainwright's assessment of Leeds Labour politics, and on several of the interviews with planners and politicians in Leeds, particularly those listed in Appendix 1 as L9, L10, L61, L62, L108 and L109. This is not to deny that there were differences between the three main parties and that different policy emphases were pursued, sometimes vigorously. Nor does it deny the significance of forces outside the dominant alliance, which on occasions have been able to force their concerns on to the political stage, through one or other of the main parties or interest groups. But these more marginalised concerns have had to live with the more 'hegemonic' control exercised by the main forces, even where these have changed their 'project', as in the shift away from large scale physical restructuring in the 1970s or the greater pro-city region economic intervention in the 1980s. The existence of the West Yorkshire County Council from 1974 to 1986 allowed a broader regional focus to be expressed on occasions, and, given Conservative control between 1978-1982, a further moderating of policies. This evolving cross class alliance has been based on the changing but broadly mutually supporting divisions of civil society and economy outlined above, which have prevented the persistent domination of any single class interest or political formation.

The implications of this situation were that planning normally had a milder, more moderate form, less 'municipalist' and less interventionist than in Manchester and more oriented towards 'third force' approaches reflected in housing associations or, to some degree, residents associations and other 'voluntary' groupings. It will be seen that this influenced the approaches to local planning.

### Manchester

In Manchester 1974 did not constitute a significant political break as it did in Leeds.<sup>2</sup> The council's area remained the same (see Map 2). Earlier in the century the city had had a fairly mixed class character, but increasingly those on higher incomes had

moved further out - in conurbation terms Manchester and Salford have lost since 1961 about the same as the other eight metropolitan districts have gained. So Manchester's population declined from 660,000 in 1961 to 451,000 in 1985 - though the rate of decline was quite slight by the 1980s.

The economy based within the city was traditionally mixed, with a large manufacturing sector and a major finance and servicing role in and near the city centre. From 1961 onwards the manufacturing base declined, 57% of jobs disappearing by 1981, and so by the 1980s the role had changed from industrial city to regional service centre - by 1981 72% of the city's employment was in services, with the public sector having a major role, through the council, the higher education precinct and hospitals (Bentley, Marshall, Mawson, Miller, 1984).

The city council has been controlled nearly continuously by the Labour party since 1945, with Conservative rule only from 1967 to 1971. In the 1980s Conservative activity has declined dramatically, so that by 1986 the elections gave Labour 86 seats, Conservatives 7 and Liberals 6. Liberal support has never been large but there have been two phases of minor importance in the mid 1960s and the 1980s. The Labour Party has only partially reflected the changing economic base, with a rather mixed leadership in social terms, during the majority of the period, then challenged from the late 1970s by a younger and slightly more middle class and public sector based group, which gained control in 1984.

There have only been weak union-Labour party links; the unions, particularly in engineering, regarded themselves as able to represent the most important interests of labour on their own. This meant, as Wainwright explains in her account of Manchester's recent Labour history (1987), that the party had for long been quite heterogeneous, not industrially dominated, although up to 1984 the engineering base was one important element. The disagreements of the late 1970s and 1980s cannot be described only as right-left struggle; the newer groupings are mainly more left wing, but the differences are expressed as much in the field of social movements where right and left divisions may matter less than class and life experience. Wainwright argues that it was not that the old grouping was reactionary on policies, but that they had different ideas on proper ways of governing, on the relationship of party, councillors and leaders and on relations with the new social movements. The 'exile' of the younger councillors between 1980 and 1984, when increasing numbers

were expelled from the Labour Group for voting against spending cuts, led these councillors to turn more to extra-municipal campaigns and organisations. They became in this way particularly strong, once in power after 1984, on community and equal opportunity issues, rather than employment or industry questions - compared with say the Leeds, Sheffield or Birmingham leadership. Divisions have also been seen partly in geographical terms, with the old leadership based in (industrial) east Manchester and the new one in north and inner south Manchester. (see Wainwright, 1987 and Appendix 2 interviews, especially M57 and M93).

Political developments have therefore reflected changing class, sector, gender and to some extent ethnic relations. Sectoral changes have been most visible in housing and transport terms. In transport the city's population has remained significantly dependent on buses and rail, with the percentage of those using cars for the journey to work increasing, but from a low base - 20% in 1971, 38% in 1981. The decline in the proportion of households who do not own cars has been correspondingly gradual, (72% in 1966, 68% in 1971, 60% in 1981). This reflects the fact that the city has tended to have an increasing proportion of low income residents (see Manchester City Council, 1986, 'Poverty in Manchester', Appendix 2 M23B). The housing tenure changes have also been rather different from those typical either of other large cities or England generally. The main shift has been from private rented (1961 41%, 1971 31%, 1981 17%) to council rented (1961 25%, 1971 36%, 1981 47%), with an unusually small increase in owner occupation (1961 29%, 1971 33%, 1981 36%). This reflects then the impact of council policies, meshing with overall socio-economic changes within the conurbation, with a major shift of those moving into owner occupation to districts outside the city, where new private estates were being built.

Manchester has attracted settlement from other countries for many years, with large Irish, Jewish, East European and Afro-Caribbean immigrations at various periods up to the 1950s and then significant numbers of Indians and Pakistanis in the 1950s and 1960s. The earlier immigrants have largely spread out throughout the conurbation, after earlier concentrations in certain areas, but there is a significant black population still within Manchester, with about 34,000 people in New Commonwealth and Pakistan headed households in 1981 (8% of the city's population) - this is about twice the number in 1971, which in turn is twice that in 1961. As in Leeds this black settlement has begun to have political effects, although so far mainly through the

turbulence created by the 1981 riots in Moss Side rather than by major presence as councillors or by powerful voluntary organisations. This may be partly because much of the Afro-Caribbean population is anglicised to a significant extent, having been arriving gradually since the beginning of the century, whilst the Asian communities made up only 2% of the total city population in 1981.

Questions of gender relations have also begun to have increasing salience in the 1980s, as the traditional working class assumptions of female and male roles have been dissolving - partly under pressure from unemployment, partly from ideas from the women's movement, also quite strong in Manchester with its major student presence and large public sector employment. During most of the period however 'normal' ideas of the council's role in relation to 'women's spheres' - home, childcare, health - have prevailed, within the welfare state conception of these issues (see Wainwright 1987 and Appendix 2 interviews, especially M24A and M59).

No doubt this characterisation is over simple in many respects. It fails to catch the degree to which council policies were genuinely radical on occasion. Manchester is, in some ways like Leeds, a 'multi-class' centre, given its position as regional capital, containing in its centre a wide range of economic forces as well as ideological importance. Thus there could be opposition to the radical municipalism from 'outside' the electoral space of the city council. However solid Labour control may appear within the peculiarly 'inner city' council boundary, the powers of other classes and ideologies are always immediately tangible, even if the individuals concerned may live far beyond the city boundaries. These forces may then become felt through various other governmental and financial agencies based in or controlling the city.

Nevertheless the overall character of Manchester cannot be caught by the term 'cross-class alliance', as it was argued could be done in Leeds. It is true that the Greater Manchester County Council was Conservative controlled between 1978 and 1982, putting some regional break on some aspects of policies within Manchester. But this served more to emphasise the firmly Labour character of the core local authority jurisdiction, broadly reflecting the dominant nature of the civil society and local divisions of labour within Manchester's boundary. Through most of the period this was manifested in a 'hegemonic project' which could be described as 'Left Labourist' or 'municipal socialist'. This meant primarily a strong commitment to public provision of services and an interventionist stance to support this across several fields



- housing, social services, shopping. The struggles of 1980-84 resulted in some degree of shift towards the concerns of some of the new social movements, especially on equal opportunities issues, stemming in part from the nationally evolving 'new urban left' agenda of the period (see Gyford 1985, Stoker 1988). This shift was caused in part too by the economic changes described above, breaking some of the base of local 'Labourist' power. There were therefore what can be called loosely 'intra-class alliance' shifts in Manchester, rather than the more fluid and uncertain balance present in Leeds. These shifted the approaches to planning in different ways from in Leeds, causing generally rather more suspicion of non-municipal initiatives on local planning and a more ideologically committed assessment of projects and proposals, against more pragmatic tendencies in Leeds.

### **C Leeds - Local Planning Approaches**

In Leeds, four periods of local planning approaches have been identified. A shorthand summary of the main dimensions of local planning changes and the role of the major factors in these changes is given in Figures 5 and 6 (and for Manchester in Figures 7 and 8).

#### 1966 - 74

Local planning during these years consisted primarily of relating the Development Plan to the specifics of particular sites and projects, whether privately or publicly promoted.<sup>3</sup> This relating might be done by the project management processes of the redevelopment programme, connecting especially the strong Housing and Engineer's departments, or by the development control process. The connecting or relating was not normally carried out by any area oriented framework. It is evident that several such frameworks were initiated (as will be described in the local case studies), but there is no information suggesting that such District or Environmental Appraisals progressed very far. Only in the case of the Chapeltown plan, which began as a study group in 1973 to investigate the problems of the area (see Farnell 1983 p 81), was such an initiative carried through to a plan form.

The Development Plan, originally dating from 1951, was submitted in revised form in 1968 and approved in 1972. Therefore at a very broad level the city possessed

a relatively recent and authoritative document; but the Plan was limited in most areas to showing major road proposals, some public facilities and the most general zoning divisions. By the early 1970s it was also becoming out of date in many areas due to shifts in the housing and road programmes.

'Local planning' was therefore constituted by the making of a very broad brush plan in the mid 1960s, through a process of centralised officer and senior councillor decision making, and the detailing of this plan by also centralised and mainly official-run inter-departmental procedures. Before 1971 planners were located in the City Engineer's department; after that date a Development Department (containing Estates and Planning sections) was part of a 'super-department' of Technical and Planning Services, with Engineers and Architects, and run by the previous City Engineer. There is little evidence at this stage that local planning had a significant role in the council.

The local planning approach in this period reflected the connection between the statutory plan system still in use (with no local attempt at using the new structure plan system as in some cities) and the mode of operating the major public programmes. These in turn were based on the 'hegemonic project' of reconstructing the city, which, it was argued above, was in part common to Labour and Conservative parties. The council machine remained centralised and little opened to outside pressures, although the rise of community action from 1970 onwards linked to a Liberal revival in some inner areas and helped to secure shifts in the redevelopment programme in 1971-72. Professional influences seem to have reinforced these tendencies up to 1974. Nevertheless the main factor behind the approach must be seen as the form of the major public development programmes and the political and organisational machinery running these.

#### 1974 - 1976

The changed area of the Leeds local authority, described above, provides the main explanation for some of the differences between local planning in Leeds and the other major English cities between 1974 and 1986. However the way in which this changed boundary affected local planning varied over these years, depending on more specific factors.<sup>4</sup>

In 1974 a significant programme of local plan making was proposed, including 8 statutory district and 9 statutory action area plans, and 7 non-statutory interim planning policies (Farnell 1983 p 43). Complete coverage with 31 District Plans was eventually intended. A well staffed local plans group was set up to tackle this programme. However, within two years experience in the inner areas (Chapeltown and Hunslet) and outer areas (Otley) convinced those involved (according to Shelton, Jones and Titterington 1979) that this type of exercise was not practical. In the outer areas the absence of a structure plan blocked progress; in the inner city the lack of control over investment and the mutual ignorance of planners and other departments of each other's modes of operating were seen as the main obstacles to progressing District Plans (Shelton et al 1979 p 113). The corporate aspirations involved in the Chapeltown exercise were seen as unrealistic in these circumstances - despite the claim that a comprehensive set of housing proposals and some traffic management measures were achieved (Shelton et al 1979 p 112).

At the same time an ambitious authority-wide 'Environmental Policy Plan', promoted by the Director of Planning in 1974, faded away by 1976, again due to unrealisable corporate aspirations (Farnell 1983 p 48). After 1976 no more plans of these kinds were attempted. The extensive public participation in the Chapeltown and Hunslet exercises was not repeated at least in such a wide ranging manner and touching open endedly so many issues.

This phase can be seen as formed primarily by the aspirations of leading planners, though supported by some Labour leaders (in control of the council until 1975) affected by the community action concerns of the previous years. These aspirations drew strength from the idea of using the new planning instruments and from the partial switch to a programme of housing rehabilitation, focusing attention on the now to be (partially) retained areas.

However the basis for such a new planning approach and extensive use of statutory plans was in fact slight. The removal of powers to the county council, especially those on the structure plan and for transport, weakened the city council. There were only limited moves to any restructuring away from departmental control, to corporate systems; for housing renewal no new local forms were created. The loss of steam from the redevelopment programme was not replaced by a vigorous push for rehabilitation, especially after the loss of Labour control in 1975. Thus the main

programme controls and the political circumstances both pushed against the professional hopes of planners, who were obliged to revise their aims - at least pending any changes in their working context.

#### 1976 - 81

This period saw first of all a very low key approach to local planning, marked by two quick and informal exercises in 1977 (in Headingley and Sheepscar).<sup>5</sup> The approach appears to have been one of waiting for more propitious circumstances. To some extent these circumstances arrived in 1978-80, with three changes. Firstly in 1978 the Inner Area Programme (IAP) was initiated, with a small budget (£2 million for 1979-80), the environmental improvement part of which was controlled by the Planning Department. The method of allocating funds in the first years of the IAP was to choose different priority areas; this area emphasis tended naturally to lead to at least the consideration of area frameworks. Most of the informal planning frameworks carried out in these years were for areas thus prioritised (in Holbeck, Hunslet, Lower Meanwood, Harehills, Sheepscar, Richmond Hill); the two processes reinforced each other. These exercises were normally relatively quickly carried out (often in less than a year), with some public consultation but related just to the land use issues in question. They aimed to arrange and order mainly public investment, not to control it.

The second change arose from the completion of the draft Structure Plan and the Plan's approval in 1980. This gave the impetus to the preparation of outer area statutory plans, with seven begun between 1979 and 1983. In effect this simply continued the professional aspiration of 1974, arising from the very large new authority with significant amounts of private development pressure in parts of these areas.

The third change was in the political control of the council, with majority control lost by Conservatives in 1979 and obtained by Labour in 1980. This favoured a less restrictive local spending policy and a more supportive approach to planning in general, although the reductions in public spending nationally moved the programme context in the opposite direction.

Overall these three elements, stemming from local and national policy and political

changes, were responsible for giving some encouragement from 1978 to the preparation of planning frameworks - statutory plans in the outer districts, informal investment coordination exercises in a few inner areas. This built on the professional preferences of officers for some degree of formal frameworks, at the least; but it still worked against many of the same forces operative in 1976, - the organisational structure of the council and the limited push behind the housing rehabilitation and many other public programmes.

#### 1981 - 86

These years saw both a somewhat greater commitment to statutory plans and at the same time a generally 'opportunistic', project based style of local planning in other respects.<sup>6</sup> Statutory plans were seen as useful in superseding the Development Plan allocations, resolving some transport issues and ensuring that all land had been examined. In the outer areas the plans were mostly moving towards completion by 1986. But of the four 'sectoral' plans for the city area only the South Leeds plan had reached an advanced stage; (Outer) North Leeds was partially prepared. Plans for East and West Leeds were deferred pending major decisions, particularly on road schemes, whilst that for Inner North Leeds was not even under consideration.

In the inner areas statutory plans were seen as of very limited use and the aim had been to produce "shorter 'no frills' plans ... and to continue to concentrate resources on 'implementation' as opposed to plan-making" (Shelton 1985 p 31). That this direction of resources could be arranged in this way partly reflected an internal reorganisation in 1982 which formed a Local Planning and Implementation Group - previously implementation had been in the development control section. This allowed most time to be spent on what were seen as the more appropriate, very informal tools - briefs, networking between the middle tier officers who had built up understandings since 1974. In the inner areas an attempt to develop a 'ward statement' approach failed to have much impact; the project proved to be too politically sensitive, given the sharp Labour/Liberal friction in some wards. The degree of public consultation and information varied considerably between issues, with the strong influence of leading councillors dictating the form of public involvement, if any. The experience of the South Leeds plan, with very few public comments or objections, suggested to officers that the public could not easily be involved in the sectoral statutory plans.

In these years then one sees the 'mature' version of the Leeds approach to local planning, mixing some commitment to formal plan making with a strongly politicised responsiveness to immediate problems - with the latter dominating in the inner and main built up areas. The decision in 1981 to move towards full statutory coverage was that of politicians, who saw such plans as important for development control, but the support of the City Planning Officer was equally significant (Brown 1982 - L12, Shelton 1985 - L9). Subsequently politicians became aware that statutory plans could not deliver improvements in themselves in the inner areas and ceased to push for them in this context.

The main evident influences on local planning in the early 1980s were therefore the preferences of senior officers and leading councillors, the latter reflecting the strong political control exercised by the firmly installed Labour group. These were in turn responding to the investment situations. In the outer areas there was still private development pressure, encouraging a statutory planning approach, and in some sectors, particularly retail, this pressure affected built up and some inner areas as well, lending support to those arguing for statutory plans for the whole authority. Public investment was increasingly uncertain and overall declining, directed mainly at the improvement of public sector housing areas - thus switching attention from the older inner areas which had been the site of informal exercises in the previous period. In 1984-86 what amounted to the initial outlines of a resourcing framework for the older residential areas was prepared, in the form of the designation of ten 'Urban Renewal Areas'. This was primarily the work of the Housing Department and was essentially a study and allocational tool for housing and environmental programmes rather than a wider spatial planning exercise. Continuing uncertainty in the roads programme weakened the chances of effective plan making in some areas. The Inner Area Programme became controlled essentially on a sectoral or theme basis, to meet challenges identified on a citywide basis - to foster economic development, support women's or ethnic minority programmes or continue with environmental improvement; after 1981 the chances of linking local planning to priority areas as in the first years were therefore absent, especially as the Programme became 'silted up' with older commitments (Cummins 1985 - L13, D Luck - L68). The organisational form of the council, still centralised and departmentalised in most respects (with just housing management decentralised to area offices in 1985), reinforced the approach to local implementation, encouraging a citywide rather than area-rooted stance.

Therefore one can see the joining of the prime professional and political actors' preferences with the economic circumstances and public programmes within the city, as setting the main approach to local planning in this period. In one sense the approach was quite different from that of 1966-74, given the absence in most of the old city area of area-specific guidance and the greater openness in public consultation on many issues. However in some other respects the forms of decision making on local planning issues had not changed so drastically, within an authority with firm political control, a relatively centralised organisation and professional departments as key actors in the operation of programmes and management of projects.

### Summary

In Leeds different factors operated differently in each period. But the dominant influences were the forms and resources of public programmes, combined with the varying political (and associated council organisational) priorities. At times professional opinions had some importance, but only when they were broadly swimming with the tide of the dominant forces - when this ceased to be the case as in 1975-76, professionals' aspirations became stranded. The available planning instruments only had a limited importance, their usage set by the other constraining factors.

## **D Manchester - Local Planning Approaches**

### 1966 - 74

The Development Plan, submitted in 1951 and approved in 1961, provided only an outline framework for local planning purposes, in Manchester, showing major road proposals and some projected facilities, but little more. In addition it was of course quite outdated by the end of the 1960s.<sup>7</sup> The council did not try to use the new planning instruments before 1974. However they did prepare what were effectively a series of district plans for the main redevelopment areas between 1969 and 1973.

These plans began as 'Housing Redevelopment Briefs', which accurately reflects their origin as a coordinating tool for the redevelopment programme. One can detect some degree of uncertainty or volatility in the changing titles in three districts - from 'outline planning brief' in Gorton in 1969, to 'redevelopment proposals' in Moss Side in 1971, to 'planning proposals' in Cheetham-Crumpsall in 1972. Mason argues in the case of the Cheetham plan that it arose from two sources, the generalised council-wide policies and the separate requirements of each council department (Mason 1977 p74). The result was that "local 'planning' may be little more than liaison work and co-ordination by the Planning Department" (1977 p 78). There was some public consultation on at least the later plans, with local exhibitions running for 1 or 2 weeks in Moss Side and Cheetham; though there is no sign that this led to changes in the plans.

These inner area plans appear to reflect the significant position of the Planning Department within the council, with a separate existence since 1963 and a strong tradition of planning thinking in the region since at least the 1920s. However they also reflect the purpose of the plans within the redevelopment programme, in which the key departments effectively controlled their own spheres - especially Housing, Engineers and Education. Planners appear to have had significant coordinating roles within this system, but, given the departmentalised and centralised form of the council, far from determinant ones.

The planning approach in this period therefore stemmed primarily from the insertion of professional planners within the main public development programmes, and the way in which the council organised these programmes - within a relatively closed, bureaucratised machine. It is true that some outside pressures were felt in the early 1970s, in the community protests in some areas against the redevelopment programme, but these had only a limited direct impact on local planning processes during these years, in spite of their substantive effect on the programmes themselves.

#### 1974 - 79

Local government reorganisation had little effect on Manchester city council other than to remove some powers to the county council and in particular weaken the Planning Department by the loss of many staff to the new County Planning Department.<sup>8</sup> Waiting for the structure plan provided an apparently good reason for



avoiding local plan making, which accorded with the preferences of the new city planning officer, who was broadly opposed to plan making throughout the rest of the study period - he doubted whether plans could be successfully implemented, so felt them politically unwise (Healey 1984 p 92).

Thus up to 1979 there was only some work on the central area plan and on plans in three river valleys, jointly with the county council. The main forms of treatment of inner area redevelopment continued essentially as before, with only limited moves to any corporate structures. The shift to rehabilitation of older housing agreed by the council in 1974 resulted in the creation of local Housing Department teams to run the renewal programme for Housing Action Areas and General Improvement Areas. But this new element was not backed by a commitment to inter-departmental working, and there was only a half-hearted drive behind the programme, with much energy still devoted to the remaining sections of the redevelopment programme until the end of the decade. This reflected the firm hold of Labour on the council and their commitment to public sector provision, and hence limited enthusiasm for the older, mainly privately owned areas within the rehabilitation programme (for example see the Housing Committee Chairman's call for a return to redevelopment in 1977, M28).

The same political attitudes were reflected in the limited extension of public participation after 1974, despite the efforts of staff in the new Housing Department teams (Stoker 1985 and M138). Other consultative tendencies were manifested in the appointments of Community Development Officers by the Social Services Department in 1974 in several inner areas (M56) and the creation of five Area Consultative Committees by the Planning Committee in 1974. But neither of these initiatives flourished, even though the first survived in a limited form until 1986 and the second until 1980 (in Wythenshawe through to 1986). The beginning of the Inner City Partnership Programme in 1978 relaxed this position slightly with moves by the council to set up local consultation meetings, resulting in the establishment of ward committees in many inner city wards. However as Williams (1983) demonstrates the council's commitment to this consultation remained variable and often weak, failing to shift the main forms of centralised political and official decision making in this period. These consisted primarily of a series of inter-departmental groupings, most importantly in the redevelopment areas the Sites Appraisal Group (Healey 1984 p 79). 'Local planning' consisted mainly of working these mechanisms with other

departments or agencies, within official settings inside the council.

Thus the approach to local planning stemmed from the attitudes of senior officers and the easy location of these attitudes within the organisational and programme forms of the period, marked by continued emphasis on redevelopment, limited commitment to rehabilitation, little private development pressure in most of the city and an essentially unchanged council organisational structure. All of these were strongly related to the preferences of the ruling Labour group, which with a large majority and a broadly supportive central government did not have to concern itself overmuch with alternative 'hegemonic projects'.

### 1979 - 82

The progress of the Greater Manchester Structure Plan to approval in 1981 removed one argument against plan making.<sup>9</sup> In 1979 internal reorganisation of the Planning Department created a separate local planning section. This provided the possibility of greater emphasis on local plans as such, but Healey notes that in 1981 the division's workload was still dominated by development briefs for council owned land, with only 7 to 8 staff net working on local plans (1984, p 82). The years up to 1982 saw a shift, though a weak one, towards preparing more planning frameworks. During these years there were proposals to prepare eight statutory plans, two of which (for East and South East Manchester) were dropped in 1982. The survivors were the central area plan, three river valley plans, Ringway (airport) plan and a plan for a small area of public housing, to be redeveloped or remodelled. In addition one informal local strategy plan was prepared in 1980-81 (in Higher Openshaw, as described in Healey et al 1988). Overall this shows that the debate within the department about the value of frameworks (evidenced by the fairly ambitious intentions in 1981 noted in Healey 1984 p 94-95) ended in the defeat of those in favour of such frameworks.

However there were two initiatives left behind in the wake of this defeat. Firstly the Inner City Partnership Programme consultative process had sparked a pressure for more information at local level; the response was a series of ward/area information documents produced for public use between 1980-82 for all inner city wards. These were certainly not forward planning exercises, but they did provide evidence of a new willingness to disseminate information, which might be used in public discussions.

Secondly within the Planning Department 'Local Planning Position Statements' were produced from 1980 onwards to summarise 'policies and attitudes' within groups of wards. These were produced for much of the city, but used very variably depending on the preferences of particular planners in each area team. They were only for internal departmental use and were seen by one planner as simply an attempt by the chief officer to deflect requests by some councillors and by some senior staff for more use of formal planning frameworks (see M 54). Their significance in the inner areas studied appears to have been limited.

In this period the same 'anti-planning framework' forces can be seen in operation as before, rather weakly opposed by some countervailing pressures - the completion of the structure plan, the differences of professional opinion within the department, the effect on the council of the consultative machinery of the Inner City Partnership Programme (ICPP). Overall the impact of the ICPP on the council was (perhaps paradoxically given the much larger funds) less than in Leeds. This was the result of a fairly early conclusion, born primarily of political and official self-confidence, that the Partnership was only of limited significance and would be seen as essentially topping up declining main programme funding. This led to a less full involvement in the consultation processes, at least after 1979 and with the exception of the post-Moss Side riots initiatives from 1981 onwards. Thus little push was given towards consideration of local areas in general and so the local planning approach was only marginally affected. Only in more general terms, in contributing to the political opening up of the council, can the ICPP be seen as significant.

Furthermore there were already further forces at work against any local frameworks, in declining and uncertain public and private investment, which meant that the formulation of any forward commitments became increasingly problematic (as argued in Healey et al 1988, McNamara 1984).

### 1982 -86

These forces continued to operate, and with increasing pressure in many respects, in the last period.<sup>10</sup> The city experienced the collapse of much of its industrial base in the early 1980s, with little new private development pressure. At the same time public programmes were mainly being cut and subjected to increasing central

government controls. The council's own ability to raise funds was being restricted. In these circumstances there was even less temptation to carry out new planning exercises, except in the form of bids for funds, as evidenced by the East Manchester Initiative in 1982-83. The remaining public finance was directed in the 1980s especially at public housing areas and thus away from most of the older residential areas.

The main change in these years was the increasing shift to a more open and consultative planning approach. This entailed support for many voluntary groups through ICPP mechanisms, including the Community Technical Aid Centre (CTAC) with a specific role in local planning. It also meant a political commitment to consult widely on local projects and initiatives, especially from 1984 when the split within the Labour group was resolved in favour of the rebel, left wing section. This commitment could easily clash with other equally firmly held political commitments, but in principle indicated an increased willingness to discuss openly council proposals.

In local planning terms the approach did not diverge in other respects from that evident since 1974 - essentially a case by case treatment of areas, responding to other agencies, within a knowledge of the areas - based on the area organisation of local planning. Though few area frameworks were produced there was therefore some sort of continuing process of local planning, within the limitations of the traditional departmental structure which Manchester retained. The discussions from 1984 of decentralisation of many council services to local offices began to have some influence on local planning at the end of the period; but no offices were actually in operation before 1986 and so the effect was limited.

The main influences on the local planning approach remained therefore as before, in even sharper relief in some respects - the uncertainty created by public and private investment, the increasing politicisation of planning issues and the general continued aversion of senior officers to planning frameworks. The older inner residential areas were receiving overall rather less council attention than in earlier years, although the 1981 riots had highlighted problems in Moss Side at least, generating specific responses. Even the shift to more open consultative processes tended to emphasise ad hoc approaches, limited to specific issues which were under council control via some special funding. This still meshed to a large extent with the departmental and professional separatism which continued to dominate many of the normal council

processes. The main factors explaining the local planning approach can therefore be seen as fixed within the professional, programme and local political spheres, particularly affected by the emergence in Manchester of the new Labour 'local socialist' tendency in the 1980s. That politics in turn was evidently affected by a wide range of forces from national politics, from local social movements and the context of economic problems within the city and its electorate. The explanatory factors therefore reach out in the period as in others to a very extensive field, even if the proximate causes may be located 'closely' within the local planning context.

## E Conclusions

It was proposed in Chapter 3 that the formation of city-wide local planning approaches could be explained by examining the joint operation of a group of factors. This created a general tendency against formalised approaches and towards ad hoc and continuous local planning. But it was suggested that there was sufficient variation in each of the factors and how they worked together to constitute the variation between cities. It is now possible to consider how the Leeds and Manchester experiences just reviewed have filled out this framework.

First it will help to summarise and contrast what the approaches were in each city. (Figures 5 and 7 summarise the dimensions of instruments (use of planning frameworks) and processes (institutional forms and interest involvement)). In a sense the experiences moved in opposite directions. Whilst Leeds before 1974 relied on the very general revised Development Plan and mainly continuous, internal planning processes, Manchester took a more formalised position in the district plans for inner areas in the early 1970s. After 1974 Leeds adopted a more plan oriented stance, even though this was highly variable, in time and place, and after 1982 the formalised element had very little importance in the inner areas. Manchester on the other hand, despite a period of debate and limited plan making in 1979-82, became generally committed to a continuous and relatively opportunistic local planning style throughout its area. In terms of institutional forms, internally this difference was reflected in Leeds Planning Department's greater prioritising of local planning work; externally - in the councils as a whole - Manchester's initial post-1974 move to local teams effectively stopped at a limited housing improvement role and both councils remained

in mainly traditional form up to 1986. In terms of the involvement of interests both approaches contained moments when there was greater openness to participatory or consultative planning at local level. These included a short period after 1974 (more pronounced in Leeds), the early Inner Area Programme/Inner City Partnership initiatives in 1978-79 (again more so in Leeds) and then more consistently and extensively with the 'local socialist' consultative orientations in the early 1980s, again in both councils but more firmly in Manchester from 1984.

Taking the three dimensions together one sees therefore some limited variation in institutional forms and in interest involvement, rather more on the use of informal area planning frameworks. The latter variation is still one of degree, rather than a major difference, as far as the inner areas are concerned; the main distinction was that Leeds used informal frameworks in a number of inner areas between 1974 and 1981 (especially in 1978-79), as against Manchester's redevelopment planning briefs of 1969-73 and the solitary informal framework in Higher Openshaw in 1980.

In order to explain this limited variation one may plausibly therefore look for relatively slight differences between the cities - assuming one does not imagine much larger currents partly cancelling each other out. The main factors identified as of significance were:-

- (i) the low levels of private development pressure, which worked in the same direction in each city in the older or built up areas, against planning frameworks, but encouraged formal, statutory plan making in the outer areas of Leeds after 1979;
- (ii) the forms of public programmes in each period, broadly working in the same way in each city, but with some variation, in the following ways:-
  - (a) where redevelopment was involved, (in both cities generally to 1974 and in more restricted areas up to 1980 in Manchester and to 1986 in Leeds), the forms of working derived from the redevelopment 'machine', which contained a larger professional planning input in Manchester (hence the early 1970s plans);

- (b) later relatively weak rehabilitation programmes restricted the drive to organisational or political concentration on the older residential areas in both cities, and so weakened the call for guiding frameworks;
  - (c) somewhat more pressure for area orientations arose in Leeds from the inner area programme initiative of 1978, resulting in some informal plan making, but this became more like the Manchester experience, through centralised prioritising, from 1980 onwards;
  - (d) generally centralised and departmentalised organisation of programmes restricted possible control through local frameworks in each city;
  - (e) declining levels and decreasing flexibility of most public development programmes in both cities from the mid-1970s onwards reduced the possibility of making forward commitments;
- (iii) city political circumstances, affecting both the above programme factors and the approach to institutional change and interest involvement; these were seen as fluctuating by period and partly by political control of the council, with the periods of Conservative control in Leeds, of dominant 'municipal Labourism' in Manchester and the degrees of 'opening out' in both cities under Labour control in the 1980s being the main moments of variation. Overall the political forms in Leeds, given their location within, it was argued, a 'cross class alliance', were more conducive, through most of the period, to more 'pluralist' and open processes - more interests had to be considered, more challenges responded to; only after 1984 did Manchester move to a stance which encouraged rather more consultative planning;
- (iv) professional orientations within Planning Departments were seen as significant in encouraging the greater degree of support in Leeds for plan making - this operating primarily at Chief Officer or divisional head level. These however were clearly in part responding to the other three factors and had to work within partly determined national and local

circumstances. The failure of certain initiatives, such as the Leeds push for corporate-oriented planning in 1974-76, indicates some limits facing planners as agents, whatever the professional preference of the period might be - the understanding of these limits being then refocused through national professional discussion.

Taking these four factors as a whole one may then consider the interrelation between the last two, indicating the scope for local 'pro activeness', and the 'structural' context of the first two, within which the significant agents - leading politicians and senior officers in particular - had to operate. In the formation of local planning approaches - both the major common features and the somewhat lesser differences - one can suggest an interpretation of city 'pro activeness' similar to that in many of the locality studies carried out in the 1980s. That is, there was some room for different movement locally, but only within constraints to an extent common to each city in each period. The slightly less opportunistic or short-term-oriented local planning in Leeds after 1974 reflected partly the different constraints imposed by the private economic activity in the new authority context. The planning approach also though reflected political and professional understandings of the context, formed in part from the different traditions and recent histories, the varying dynamics of the hegemonic project in each city, the shifts created in these by new social movements, the changing divisions of civil society.

This explanation fills out and puts into action the framework presented in Chapter 3, by showing the complex interrelations between factors in the real history in two cities. It does not directly challenge the explanations of the major writers discussed in Chapter 2, accepting the degrees of structural constraint emphasised by Farnell, the influence of political and ideological understandings also stressed by Brindley, Rydin and Stoker and Healey et al, and the scope for creating appropriate local responses, in part by professional pressure, argued by Bruton and Nicholson. Given the complexities of the interrelation of these factors, it is impossible to assign weights to each. It is more important to grasp the 'duality of structure' that reigns in this context, springing from the political economy of the period, with two significant political city jurisdictions within strong wider economic and political forces. Both a degree of commonality and a degree of divergence, in these circumstances, is to be expected. Some 'causal' and willed variation has been possible, in the setting of local planning approaches as in other policy fields. Within broad structural constraints



some degree of locally specific differentiation conditioned each city's approach.

Given an understanding of general approaches it will now be possible to examine how these were operated in specific areas, through detailed study of local processes. This will be the task of the following chapters.

## FOOTNOTES

- 1 This account draws extensively on Fraser (1980) as well as on Faith in Leeds (1986 - L14), the chapter by Bateman in Gordon (1986), Wainwright (1987) and Wiener (1976, 1977).
- 2 This account draws extensively on the chapter by Rodgers in Gordon (1986), Wainwright (1987), Stoker (1985), Stevens (1985) as well as specifically quoted sources.
- 3 See Leeds Development Plan (1955) and Development Plan Revision (1972), Fraser (1980) chapters 17 and 18, Gibson and Langstaff (1982, chapter 8), Interview with Shelton (L9), Fitzpatrick et al (1975) and early Planning Department files (L 40-42 and 94-96).
- 4 See Farnell (1983) and Shelton, Jones, Titterington (1979).
- 5 See Farnell (1983), Shelton, Jones, Titterington (1979), Shelton (1985), Cummins (1985 - L13), Brown (1982 - L12), Shelton (1981 - notes of talk Birmingham Polytechnic, October 1981).
- 6 See Shelton (1981, 1985) and Shelton (L9).
- 7 See Manchester Development Plan (1961), Mason (1977), Healey (1984), Rodgers, in Gordon (1986), Stoker (1985), Wheale (1974). M1-3 (general), M32 (Cheetham), M66 (Gorton), M98 (Moss Side), M148, M149 (Moss Side).
- 8 See Mason (1977), Healey (1984), Lambert and Underwood (1984), McNamara (1984), Healey et al (1988), Stoker (1985), Wheale (1979), Williams (1983) and M4-6 (general).
- 9 See secondary references as in (8) above and M7-13, 24, 24a.
- 10 See secondary references as in (8) above and M14-21, 24, 140, 141.

Figure 5

## NATURE OF LOCAL PLANNING IN LEEDS 1966 - 1986

Period	Use of Planning Frameworks	Institutional Forms	Interest Involvement
1966-74	Development Plan at general level; originally submitted 1951, approved 1955, revision submitted 1968, approved 1972. Below this layouts for specific developments, and some sporadic work on district study exercises.	Centralised process controlled by senior officers and leading councillors, with planning inside City Engineer's Department, and from 1971 in Technical and Planning Services.	No system for involving local interests beyond activity of local councillors. But increasing pressure from groups in some areas in 1970s.
1974-76	Ambitious local plan programme, including inner areas, and with corporate aspirations. Wide ranging plans attempted in Chapeltown and Hunslet, with mixed or poor results. Four outer area plans begun.	Separate Planning Department created but powers lost to County Council. Separate local plans group of significant size. No formalised local mechanisms; housing renewal via central section in Housing Department, with functions also in Environmental Health and Architects.	Considerable public participation by residents in Hunslet and Chapeltown inner area exercises.
1976-81	Reduced statutory plan programme, though including central business area plan and move to plans for outer areas from 1979. Informal planning frameworks for 8 inner areas with specific land issues, especially grouped around Inner Area Programme priorities of 1978-79.	No significant change. Structure Plan approved 1980.	Important degree of public involvement, though mainly limited to specifically land-related issues.
1981-86	Decision to move to full statutory coverage, progressing to achievement in outer areas but only one of five plans including inner areas far advanced by end of study period. No use of even informal area frameworks in inner areas in this period.	Internal changes (1982) in Planning Department merged local planning and implementation sections, giving chance to shift staff resources to implementation. Main departmental structures for planning and renewal unchanged.	Variable local involvement depending on issues and political circumstances, on ad hoc basis.

Figure 6 SIGNIFICANCE OF INFLUENCES ON LOCAL PLANNING IN LEEDS 1966-1986

Period	Nature of Planning Instruments	Nature of Public Programmes	Professional Factors	City Economic Circumstances	City Political Circumstances	City Organisational Circumstances
1966-74	Development Plan not easily adapted to local planning, only partly supplemented by attempts at more local exercises and development briefs. New system not tried.	Redevelopment programme moving uncertainly, sometimes more slowly, but with roads programme setting citywide pattern of large scale planning. Rehabilitation programme seen generally as only holding exercise.	Increasing role of planners but without separate department only limited influence.	Relatively prosperous city economy encouraging active public intervention.	Alleviating political control allowing some influence on programmes by some local interests as well as increasing uncertainty in these programmes.	Some moves to more corporate organisation at end of 1960s but in fully centralised and relatively traditional form.
1974-76	Local plans seen as usable instruments, though some constraint via control of structure plan by county and interim nature of local plans.	Partial switch of emphasis to rehabilitation encouraged new focus on some inner areas, but with declining impetus.	Planning function seen as important, with separate department and significant local planning section, favouring local planning frameworks.	No change.	No change - volatility partly channelled through Liberal resurgence.	Some move to more corporate forms but not becoming firmly rooted. No local renewal organisation.
1976-81	In principle easier production of local plans after Inner Areas Act 1978 and Structure Plan approval 1980.	Mainly declining and uncertain programmes, though road programme cuts created more certainty in some areas and from 1978 Inner Area Programme provided some new funding.	No change, though Chapelown Plan experience discouraging more formal inner area exercises.	Economic problems increasing but still private development pressure in outer areas and city centre.	Conservative control to 1979 limiting political interest in local planning, Labour control from 1980 encouraging emphasis especially on public housing areas. Significant pressure from some local groups.	Move away from even limited corporate forms.
1981-86	No change.	Main emphasis on public housing areas and on economic development though some clarification of road programme.	Increasing preference for mainly ad hoc planning response, though seeing some value of statutory plans for some situations.	Economic problems encouraging major emphasis on regeneration, but development pressure remaining in outer areas and in certain sectors eg retail.	Firm Labour council control, some pressure from riots and recently organised women's and ethnic interests.	Centralised and mainly non-corporate forms continued.

Figure 7

## NATURE OF LOCAL PLANNING IN MANCHESTER 1966 - 1986

Period	Use of Planning Frameworks	Institutional Forms	Interest Involvement
1966-74	Development Plan (prepared 1951, approved 1961) provided only broad framework of roads and some major facilities. From late 1960s supplemented in many inner areas by 'Housing Redevelopment Briefs', informal generalised district plans.	Separate Planning Department linked in inter-departmental mechanisms running redevelopment programme, in centralised municipal form.	Very limited local public involvement, although in some areas groups able to apply pressure in early 1970s to change redevelopment decisions.
1974-79	Very little emphasis on local planning frameworks - some work on central area and on river valleys with county council.	Main elements of previous structure continued, though local teams set up within Housing Department (1975) to organise much of housing rehabilitation; these teams only weakly linked to other departmental processes. Loss of some powers to county council.	Some local involvement via Housing Department teams and from 1978 via ward committees under Inner City Partnership arrangements in many wards; but rarely extensive or continuing.
1979-82	Slightly more emphasis on planning frameworks, with moves to carry out or complete eight statutory plans (several with county council) - two dropped in 1982. One local strategy plan carried out 1980-81. Area information exercises for inner wards. Internal local planning position statements.	Main elements of previous structure continued, but internal reorganisation of Planning Department put more stress on local planning role. Structure Plan approved 1981.	In some areas more significant consultative role, partly via various Inner City Partnership mechanisms and pressure from local voluntary groups.
1982-86	Only completion of existing statutory plans, and continuation of information exercises (ward statements 1985-86).	No major changes, though decentralisation to neighbourhood offices of most council services under discussion 1984 onwards.	Support for Community Technical Aid Centre and increasingly open approach to public consultation on many projects.

Figure 8 SIGNIFICANCE OF INFLUENCES ON LOCAL PLANNING IN MANCHESTER 1966-1986

Period	Nature of Planning Instruments	Nature of Public Programmes	Professional Factors	City Economic Circumstances	City Political Circumstances	City Organisational Circumstances
1966-74	Development Plan not well adapted to detailed local planning, new statutory plan system not used in period.	Redevelopment programme encouraged large scale centralised planning, though losing some momentum at end of period.	Strong planning role favouring some form of frameworks/briefs.	General prosperity encouraging forward commitments.	Changes in political control having only secondary effects, but local protests against redevelopment influential 1973-74.	Centralised and departmentalised council structure.
1974-79	Some constraint via loss of powers to county council and lengthy preparation of Structure Plan.	Switch to rehabilitation programme only led to partial turn to retained older areas. Continued concentration on redevelopment process with continued high funding. Inner City Partnership Programme providing minor new funding.	Little enthusiasm for new statutory plans system or for planning frameworks in general.	Little private development pressure in most of city.	Firm Labour control, relatively low level of group or other party activity.	Little change to older structure, though loss of some powers to county council and formation of local teams for renewal, within Housing Department.
1979-82	Structure Plan approved 1981.	Programmes generally declining, especially reducing roads programme though emphasis on public facilities and environmental improvement continuing.	New emphasis from reorganised local planning section on more use of planning frameworks, though still general tendency against formalisation.	Continuing absence of private development pressure, reinforced by economic collapse, emphasised specific projects and initiatives, not area frameworks.	More localised group activity, partly connected to ward committees set up within Inner City Partnership. 1981 riots creating some attention for inner areas.	Some limited shifts via consultation machinery, especially for Inner City Partnership, but remaining essentially same structure.
1982-86	No change.	Continuing decline in public programmes with shift to spending in public housing areas and on economic regeneration.	Increasingly supportive of ad hoc consultative planning around projects and initiatives.	Economic collapse continued to push in same direction.	Conflict in Labour Party resulting in 1984 shift to new more open style of planning.	No change, though discussion of decentralisation from 1984 encouraging consultative processes.

Figure 9

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS 1971-81

Specification of variables	GB	max	min	Leeds	Mc + Slfd
Population change (%) 1971-81	0.6	60.8	- 12.4	- 3.6	- 11.1
% aged over pensionable age 1981	17.5	35.8	10.6	17.8	17.8
Change (%) in number of households 1971-81	7.1	68.9	- 4.6	2.8	- 4.6
Econ. active per 100 econ. inactive 1981	110.4	178.3	85.2	109.0	108.6
Married female economic activity rate 1971-81	48.8	64.8	27.6	54.3	53.1
Change (%) in married female economic activity rate 1971-81	8.1	17.2	1.6	7.0	7.6
Employment change (%) 1971-78	2.7	49.2	- 20.9	- 0.3	- 2.9
Employment change (%) 1978-81	- 5.1	22.4	- 34.1	- 6.4	- 8.1
Manufacturing employment change (%) 1971-81	- 24.3	287.2	- 55.7	- 32.8	- 35.1
Service employment change (%) 1971-81	13.5	162.0	- 20.4	10.9	4.2
Unemployment rate change (%) 1971-81	4.6	17.2	- 0.3	4.7	6.3
Unemployment rate May 1985	13.2	26.4	4.1	12.6	13.6
% economically active in managerial and professional SEGs (1-4, 13) 1981	16.2	27.4	7.5	15.6	14.3
% households with 2 or more cars 1981	15.5	34.3	6.8	12.4	12.3

Source: Changing Places ed Champion AG et al 1987 E Arnold London

Figure 10 COUNCIL CONTROL IN LEEDS AND MANCHESTER 1966-1986

Year	Leeds		West Yorks		Manchester		Greater Man CC	
	Lab	Cons	Lab	Cons	Lab	Cons	Lab	Cons
1966	65	47			87	61	3	lab
1967	55	57			73	77	1	cons
1968	16	101			61	91		cons
1969	17	98			53	99		cons
1970	27	87			66	84		cons
1971	48	61			108	24		lab
1972	70	46			99	33		lab
1973	44	38			55	40		lab
1974	44	38	lab-m		55	40		lab
1975	41	43	lab-m		54	45		lab
1976	38	50	con-m		54	45		lab
1977	38	50	cons		54	45		lab
1978	39	50	cons	1 ind	53	46		lab
1979	44	45	con-m		63	33	3	cons
1980	62	29	lab		71	23	4	lab
1981	61	29	cons		72	22	4	lab
1982	56	31	lab	1 sdp	69	25	4	lab
1983	54	33	lab	1 sdp	72	22	5	lab
1984	53	33	lab	*+lind	79	14	6	lab
1985	53	34	lab	*+lind	78	14	6	lab
1986	58	28	lab	*+2lind	86	7	6	lab

Source: Municipal Yearbook 1967-87 (m = minority, C = control)



## **CHAPTER 5      LOCAL PLANNING IN TWO LEEDS NEIGHBOURHOODS**

### **A      Introduction**

### **B      Profiles of Harehills and Richmond Hill**

### **C      Planning Episodes in Harehills**

1.      The Bansteads
2.      Other Residential Clearance Areas
3.      Rank Optics
4.      Other Industrial Sites
5.      Changes from Religious Use
6.      Analysis and Summary of Harehills Cases

### **D      Planning Episodes in Richmond Hill**

1.      The Cross Green Route
2.      The Local Centre
3.      Housing, Open Space and School Allocations

### **E      Local Planning in Richmond Hill and Harehills Compared**

## **CHAPTER 5      LOCAL PLANNING IN TWO LEEDS NEIGHBOURHOODS**

### **A      Introduction**

The studies reported here and in the next chapter examine how, within the general approach to local planning in each city, particular cases were treated within specific processes and with specific outcomes. The processes and outcomes are seen as conditioned by the factors analysed in Chapters 2 and 3, part being 'higher level' influences, part arising within the local areas. The summarising Figure 13 includes five 'higher level' factors, with the 'planning instruments' of Chapter 2 here becoming city-wide local planning approaches, given the shift down to the very local level. Within the roles of professionals/officials and councillors there are both localised and city-wide elements. No separate column for local institutional influences is included. There was virtually no decentralised council structure in Leeds; only the Area Community Education Officers, the East Leeds Team of the Industry and Employment Department (after 1981) and Housing Department management sections (after 1985) were organised in varying forms of district office. But certain other 'local social professionals' did have some roles in certain cases.

The cases are summarised in Figures 12 and 13 for both areas. Before each is presented in detail, the areas are described briefly. This will provide the substantive context which can be referred to in the analysis of the cases.

### **B      Profiles of Harehills and Richmond Hill**

#### **Harehills**

Harehills is a mainly residential area situated about 2 miles north east of Leeds city centre (see Map 3). The greater part was built between the late 1890s and 1914, consisting mainly of back to back houses, surrounding a few larger factories established about the same time. Shopping frontages and various community buildings grew up on the two main roads passing through or beside the area, Roundhay Road and Harehills Lane. As a district of the city, it covers an area with a fairly identifiable boundary, although shading off across Roundhay Road into Chapeltown; there is a kind of 'inner Harehills' of the older property, known at

least in planners' documents as the Harehills Triangle. The area studied (see Map 4) is slightly larger than that area, although not as large as the Harehills Urban Renewal Area designated in 1985 (L34; the references in this and the following chapter are listed in Appendices 1 and 2). Most of the significant environmental changes of recent years have taken place in the Harehills Triangle. The district is bordered by Chapeltown to the north west, a rather older suburb with a quite different environmental and social character, in recent years also the home of low income residents, especially immigrants from the West Indies. To the south is the vast St James's Hospital and then municipally redeveloped Burmantofts, to the east the mid century council estates of Gipton and to the north higher income suburbs.

For much of its existence Harehills has been the home of relatively well-off working class residents, benefiting from the fact that the majority of the houses were solidly built, though within a very densely developed environment. Since the 1960s the area has experienced relative social decline, with higher income residents tending to move out, replaced by Asian or other immigrants, students and other low income households. By 1981 51% of houses were owner occupied. Figure 11 shows the social and demographic situation in 1981. One can see that there is a somewhat higher number of children in the area than in Richmond Hill, also a high level of pensioners and a particularly large proportion of residents who had moved into the area within the previous year. There were high unemployment and low car ownership levels. About a fifth of the population lived in Afro-Caribbean or (mainly) Asian households. The social decline was accompanied by environmental decline, itself strongly buttressed by the blight imposed by the council's plans from the 1950s onwards.

These plans were included in the Development Plan, which was revised in the 1960s (revision completed 1968, approved 1972, L1). Part of the Plan is copied as Map 5. The main features are:

- (a) large parts of the study area in the housing redevelopment programme, with almost all the land between Roundhay Road and Harehills Lane being due for clearance at various dates up to the early 1980s;
- (b) a large area allocated for a District Centre, mainly for shopping, to be

privately redeveloped at some unspecified time. This arose from a proposal of a local retail developer, Arndale, in 1966, and required the demolition of several fairly good quality residential streets;

- (c) many houses affected by the North East Expressway scheme, with associated roads;
- (d) two large sites for new primary schools, to replace those to be demolished;
- (e) the industrial sites on the east side of Harehills Lane allocated for continued industrial use;
- (e) other land allocated for St James's Hospital, for public open space, but mainly for new housing.

This wholesale remodelling of the area was not to occur, being replaced from the mid 1970s onwards by a process of partial clearance, refurbishment of some existing houses and some provision of community facilities in existing buildings or on cleared land. This altogether smaller scale exercise (far from completed by 1986) had quite a different dynamic from the proposed redevelopment scheme, giving rise to different local reactions, organisation, incidents and different council and other agency implementation mechanisms. This history of the years from the early 1970s to 1986 is composed of the abandoning of the early plans and the working out of the alternative. This will be briefly summarised here.

The major redevelopment schemes were abandoned between 1973 and 1975, through the combination of national, city-wide and local pressures. The local component was organisation of residents against clearance in a Community Association and an Action Group, which gradually pressed the clearance dates backwards and eventually out of the programme, for most parts of the area. Both the process of the abandonment of the earlier plans and that of the adoption of new proposals was very gradual, including decisions first on areas for house improvement in 1975-6, then on land uses for the remaining clearance areas in 1979-81. It was the latter phase which brought forth two more or less comprehensive planning summaries for the Harehills Triangle, partly stimulated by the availability of Urban Programme

monies for the area from 1981. The April 1981 Proposals Plan is reproduced as Map 6. These planning statements (L21, L27) were the main significant official marker of change in the area between the 1960s proposals and 1986; although a further and lesser statement was entailed in the Urban Renewal Area exercise of 1984-87 (L34, L35) indicating future proposals for housing improvement in the area.

These actions of the council between 1974 and 1986 were primarily organised by key council officials in the main 'environmental' departments, but they were affected, sporadically and unevenly, by organised local groups and, after 1980, by active local councillors, when Labour took control of the newly defined ward. It was usually combinations of party and community politics that made effective interventions possible.

There were significant local interactions around issues other than the central one of housing futures. These included the campaigning for a lorry ban on the Roundhay Road (A58) between 1974 and 1978, the efforts to obtain a community centre in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the reactions to disturbance from St James's Hospital parking on the southern boundary and from a large DIY store on the north-east, and the issue of the future of a large industrial site (Rank Optics).

The net effect of the actions by the council, and to a lesser degree by other agencies, was by 1986 to settle the future of the area to a large extent. However the longer term renewal/refurbishment of houses and other buildings was by no means completed by then. One major issue, the fate of the large factory site (Rank Optics), was resolved between 1986 and 1989 and to provide a coherent history the study period was extended to 1989 for this case. In addition one major new issue, the building of two replacement primary schools in the area, arose in 1985-86 and required fresh responses from, especially, planning officials and leading councillors. But to a large extent a key decade in the history of the area, from around 1972 to 1982, had settled its future. The area had emerged physically somewhat altered - some redevelopment and some refurbishment, and with some social changes - more owner occupation, a shift in the ethnic origins of the population, but remaining primarily of lower income residents. But it was still essentially recognisable as 'the

same place’.

### Richmond Hill

Richmond Hill is a primarily residential area situated quite near to Leeds city centre, less than half a mile from its western end (see Map 3). Its relationship to surrounding areas has been changed significantly by developments of the last 20-30 years, so that it now has a rather isolated, island-like, character (see Map 7). It is bordered to the north by the York Road, widened in the early 1970s to a major dual carriageway route with heavy traffic. The area beyond the road, Burmantofts, was redeveloped by that time and so the earlier link of the two areas, sealed around the radial shopping route on York Road, was broken, especially as the great majority of the shops were removed. On the west lie a mainly industrial zone and major roads, on lower ground between Richmond Hill and the city centre, whilst to the south is the Cross Green industrial estate, though with views beyond out to semi-countryside. Only to the east is there some ‘urban continuity’, via areas of more recent housing stretching out through council estates to higher income areas like Halton.

The area was mostly developed in the late nineteenth century, somewhat earlier than Harehills, although the eastern part near East End Park appeared later, some streets being from the interwar years. There is thus a significant historical difference between the section west of the main railway line, the greater part of which has been redeveloped and that to the east, most of which remains. In fact the very name ‘Richmond Hill’ has rather less hold on the study area than in the Harehills case. Probably most officials and many residents would recognise the study area under this name, but sometimes the eastern part is called East End Park, whilst Cross Green, to the south of another railway line, also has a somewhat separate character. The ward name and the use of the title by council officials and in newspapers has probably helped recently to make the identity firmer than in the past. Its social and demographic character in 1981 can be seen in Figure 11. There one can perceive a mainly British born and white population with relatively conventional household patterns and fairly high numbers of pensioners. Unemployment was not quite as high as in Harehills, but the car ownership figures

imply equally low incomes.

The council's plans, as incorporated in the Development Plan Review, involved redevelopment of virtually all the study area (see Map 8) and use of the land mainly for new housing and associated facilities, but with a major road, the Halton Expressway, as well, along with the widening of York Road. The main difference from Harehills was then that this grand sweep was abandoned only to a partial degree, and much more slowly than occurred in Harehills.

The western part of the area was mostly redeveloped approximately as intended, though with the omission of a few streets (the Kitsons) and most of Cross Green. The redevelopment occurred very slowly, starting early in the 1970s and continuing after 1986. In 1986 some clearance still remained to be completed, as well as some housing schemes, some public open space and shops intended in the Local Centre. What did change significantly in this section was the proposed major road which was moved successively further south, so that by 1986 the line was placed between Cross Green school and the industrial estate - and was again under review (see Map 9).

The eastern part of the area was gradually, almost imperceptibly, removed from the redevelopment scheme, so that by the end of the 1970s it was known that only a few particularly poor blocks were designated for clearance. The reprieve was mainly the result of the overall council policy shift towards retention. Nearly all the area had been in Improvement Grant Areas in the late 1960s and one small part became an HAA in 1978. However there was only limited council activity towards the area, with a certain amount of modernisation of the council owned houses (a significant proportion in the area) and some improvements to the recreation ground and East End Park.

The majority of attention, of both council and residents, was therefore directed to the western section, particularly to the slow progress of redevelopment and also the absence of improvement particularly in Cross Green (the other retained area, the Kitsons, was council owned and was improved up to a certain point). This slow progress led to concern in and about the area, including local organisation by the

Liberals and activity by local churches. By 1978 the redevelopment process had reached a position where some firming up of plans was both possible and necessary. This coincided with the local pressure and with the second Inner Area Programme allocation, in which Richmond Hill was designated one of the two Priority Areas. This led to an Appraisal by the Planning Department of the area in 1979 (L83). With some Urban Programme, and more main programme (housing) funds, some elements of the redevelopment were completed in the early 1980s, with continued attention directed to the area by the competition of Liberal and Labour councillors and the presence of Inner Area Programme funded community workers. Residents' worries turned rather more to the increasing decay in Cross Green though to no effect before 1986.

There were a number of less evident issues in the area, such as the effect of through traffic and the organisation of bus routes, and the availability of local shopping provision, but even more so than in Harehills the main decisions centred round the main redevelopment/rehabilitation 'cycles'. To a large extent the turbulence generated by the 1960s proposals had, in one form or another, settled by 1986.

## **C Planning Episodes in Harehills**

In Harehills seven episodes or issues are examined in detail. Several other episodes or issues could have been selected for treatment; some of these have already been mentioned in the sketch above. The justification for the selection here is that these cases cover the great majority of land use decisions in the core of Harehills and illuminate the processes operating in the period central to the study, in the late 1970s and the 1980s.

In each episode a summary of the course of events will be presented, followed by analysis of the processes, outcomes and factors involved. These accounts will be brought together at the end to give an overall understanding of the conditioning of planning process in Harehills.



## 1. The Bansteads

At the time of the reports on Harehills of 1979-81, the major decision, in terms of size, concerned the use of the Banstead Grove Clearance Area site (see location on Map 6). This was the crux around which lesser decisions were centred. The main concern here is the decision on land use of 1979-81, but the prior process leading to clearance is also relevant.

### Course of Events

The clearance decision was made effectively in 1974-75 when the Harehills Triangle was split between likely improvement and clearance areas, with a third category of areas subject to review, but likely to be improved (L 17). Officials in both Planning and Housing Departments felt that the decision was not particularly logical (L9, L10); it reflected a compromise between Environmental Health officials, who favoured clearance of much of Harehills, and other departments who preferred retention. But the decision was also influenced by the Planning Department view that larger areas of clearance were desirable, partly to provide useable public open space, and the Housing Department view that larger areas of improved housing would best generate confidence and investment. The Bansteads clearance area, of 5 acres, was one result of these viewpoints, despite the fact that, according to the same officials (L9, L10), it probably did not include as poor housing as many of the blocks placed in improvement areas.

The area was 'represented' for clearance in November 1978, the start of the legal process which included a public inquiry in 1978 and confirmation in June 1980 (L26, L56). The long period of blight was probably in part responsible for the limited public opposition to clearance. The Harehills Community Liaison Group gave reluctant support for clearance, though reporting that many elderly residents were still against it (L56).

Planning officials had long considered that the Harehills area was drastically deficient in public open space. This was reflected in the Development Plan Revision (L1) and noted in the Harehills/Gipton District Appraisal of March 1974

(L 16)), although the Appraisal felt that "there would at present, seem little prospect of remedying this situation given the fully built-up character of the area and the limited opportunity for renewal" (L 16 page 5). Planning officers continued to support open space provision, although according to one official this varied; he had been favouring a 50:50 split of the Bansteads site for housing and open space, whilst he felt his section head was more for full use for open space (L 63). These views were significant, because between the production of the two reports on land use in Harehills, in February 1979 and April 1981, planners held a mediating position between other departments and locally expressed interests. In the first report (L 21) a split of 3.1 acres for housing and 2.5 acres for open space was recommended, on the planners' interpretation of local needs and of the situation of the site next to a noisy road, making that part unsuitable for housing. By September 1980 a report (L 24) reopening the issue, after confirmation of clearance, was less sure of the desired use.

Public meetings in June and November 1980 pressed strongly for open space on all the site (L 25). Since the public participation in the adjacent Conways GIA (L 50) and the formation of the Harehills Community Liaison Group in July 1979 (L27, Evening Post 24/7/1979), there had been local mothers pressing for an adventure playground and open space, pointing out that given the absence of gardens in the area only the streets were available for children's play. The 1980 Annual Report of the Community Liaison Group reflected this pressure (L 70), with the mothers' group one of the constituent elements of this umbrella organisation, which sought to link bodies such as the Methodist church, the Community Centre Steering Group and the local Muslim groups.

A petition presented at the November 1980 public meeting contained 368 signatures (L 26), although only 25 members of the public attended the meeting (L 25). There is some evidence of different interests emerging in the debate, with a representative of one Muslim group explaining that some Muslim families had both objected to clearance and wanted to see new houses on the site; he felt that it had been necessary to persuade some people of the need for open space, but that in the end the Liaison Group had expressed the views of the great majority (L 67).

In January and February 1981 planners drafted reports on both the Harehills area as a whole and the Bansteads site; the January joint report of the Housing and Planning Directors tended towards joint open space/housing use, whilst the February report moved towards support for a smaller housing element, though leaving the issue very much up to councillors (L 26). This moved effectively towards the result in the April 1981 report, which was decisive in its support for open space and abandoned all the earlier, more 'technical' discussion of noise levels and the need for a rolling programme of housing replacement (L 27). There is no doubt that this was the result of the activity of local councillors, influenced by the Liaison Group.

Both before and after their election in May 1980 the new Labour councillors were keen to find local issues with broad support, to establish themselves in a newly defined ward and against possible Liberal threats (the old ward had always been Conservative up to May 1980). One councillor was particularly active and as chair of the Inner City Sub-Committee was able to secure funds from the Inner Area Programme (IAP) for the area (L 61). Other participants agree as to his significant role (L9, L 66). IAP funding was obtained for the open space development.

The final main actors in the process were the other council departments. The Leisure Services Department not surprisingly supported all open space use (L 25). The Housing Department argued that there was a local need for rehousing from clearance areas and that use of the Bansteads was the only chance to provide this (L 25). However one official, looking back on the issue, felt that there had been little Housing Committee backing for the officers and that the housing option had stood no chance once in the public/political forum (L 10).

The park was subsequently developed in 1983-84 with Urban Programme funds, although the Liaison Group (after 1983, Action Group) felt that a great chance had been missed to involve local people in the design and construction of the scheme (L 66). The park was seen as very intensively used, reflecting the great need that it fulfilled - and suggesting the need for more space and facilities (L 66, L 67).

## Processes

If one divides the local planning process of the Bansteads into three parts, one can see that the first, deciding on clearance, and the last, design and construction, were both carried out primarily by bureaucratic processes within the local authority. This is not to say that public and councillor pressure did not impinge on both: especially in the first part the public pressure for housing retention of Harehills in the early 1970s played an important underlying role. The main part studied here, on land use, was on the other hand decided within a framework of some public debate and finally decided mainly by local councillors. Whilst the first stage of the process was primarily within 'normal' inter-departmental channels, around the February 1979 planning report, from later 1979 the issue was increasingly brought into the open, by the combination of local interests' pressure and the Labour Party activism before and after the local elections.

It is arguable that the public involvement was not extensive - this is suggested by the small public meeting attendance in November 1980. Mainly involved were a handful of key actors who through middle class or higher education characteristics were atypical of the area's residents: a community worker (and mother) resident in the area since 1977, an active Methodist minister, a university educated Muslim leader. But these actors linked to broadly spread interests more fully rooted in the area, and so can be said to 'represent' at least significant proportions of local needs and opinions.

Different actors gave differing views as to how important the local community and councillor pressure was in the land use decision. One planning official felt that they were "pushing at an open door" (L 9), whilst another planner and a Housing Department official considered that local pressure played at least some part (L 10, L 63). Local actors were of the opinion that their pressure had been necessary, against officials' definite preference for splitting the site (L 61, L 66, L 67). There is little doubt that local pressure helped to open the planning process, even though planning officials at least were already sympathetic to such opening up.

## Outcomes

The outcome at the Bansteads, the replacement of about 200 houses, many in poor condition, by a park intensively used, especially by children, naturally represented a gain for some interests, as against other potential outcomes. It represented, in broad terms, a result favourable to those who wanted better facilities for children and a better environmental character for the area. Within the council these interests were reflected especially by the professional concerns of planners, as well as by those in the Leisure Services Department. They were the interests primarily of residents already in the area and due to remain there, rather than those displaced by clearance or those hoping to find houses in the area - who would have been helped by new housing: these would have included some elderly residents and the growing Muslim communities in the area.

The fact that local political intervention helped to secure this outcome was highly contingent on the local and citywide political circumstances, with a new ward, Labour control, a very active and quite influential councillor and local groups quite well linked to the new councillors. It is notable that a similar decision was taken on the Chapeltown side of Roundhay Road, where the Giptons and Sidlaws site was also designated for open space use, not for housing, at about the same time (L 63). The view, reported favourably in the Inspector's report confirming clearance in 1980, that this was the "densest housing area in Europe" (L 56) seems to become a key part of the local 'discourse'. Within what might be called "imperfect pluralism", following Brindley, Rydin and Stoker's description of the planning process in Coin Street, Lambeth (1989, page 92), this discourse was spread fairly easily amongst the key actors and became for the leading councillor a simple and attractive handle through which he could take a generally popular, public role on an important local issue. That the outcome supported significant local interests and coincided with some professional views were factors which also mattered.

## Factors

Finally, it is possible to sum up how far each of the factors described earlier were significant. All played some part in forming the local planning process and in

producing the outcomes. But it was the highly specific and localised combination of these factors which is of most evident importance.

- (a) The city-wide approach to local planning entailed firstly a reluctance to engage in formal or statutory plan making, despite the evident supersession of the Development Plan Revision submitted in 1968. The intention in 1974-75 to move towards such formal coverage evaporated in the face of the Chapeltown experience. The more normal inter-departmental networking was evident in the Bansteads exercise; but the general openness of planners in particular to some degree of public debate and to coordination by area frameworks facilitated the opening up of the issues in 1979-81.
- (b) The scarcity of public funds for housing development and the possibility of securing IAP funding for the park helped to ease the decision towards open space use. In turn these programme factors were influenced by both national/council wide funding and by the position of the most active local councillor in controlling some access to IAP finance.
- (c) The absence of private investment pressure in any form was important, as in almost all the cases that will be reviewed in this study. There was an approach by local architects in September 1982 for a possible commercial scheme on part of the site (L 45), but this stood as little chance as earlier ideas concerning possible industrial use (mentioned and rejected by local residents) (L 66). Only very large public subsidy could have encouraged private housing or commercial schemes in this location.
- (d) In this case officials had an increasingly limited role as the issue moved into the public and political arena in 1979-81. They did however have considerable influence in the phases of clearance and implementation before and after the land use decision, and planners in particular were sympathetic to this opening of the decision making process.
- (e) Local councillors played a key role in the central land use phase, helped especially by the leading role of the most active councillor elected in 1980,

as chair of the Inner City Sub-Committee.

- (f) The specific spatial insertion of the site was important in many respects, conditioning the debate for different actors in differing directions. The noise levels of the main road affected planners views on housing use. The centrality of the site to the district, and its visibility from the main road, made it of critical interest to many residents and also to local politicians. Its large size equally heightened the salience of the decision and facilitated use for open space, compared to smaller sites. Planners and local residents were probably particularly aware of these kinds of externality effects.
- (g) The balance of organised local interests reflected unevenly the 'real' range of interests, with a preponderance of actors with experience and contacts outside the area and significant representation of local Muslims and mothers' groups. The mobilisation of this particular combination of interests through the community groups and then to local Labour Councillors contributed very significantly to the outcome. The circumstances of the period from 1973 to 1979, when the Community Association had been dominated by the more traditional long term middle aged or elderly residents of the area (see L 69, L 72, L 66, Evening Post 27/3/74 and 29/6/78), and when all local councillors had been Conservatives with greater interest in the prosperous suburbs to the north, would not have led to the same kind of process or outcomes. Nevertheless the normally very limited extent of public involvement continued to be a feature of the district throughout the period.
- (h) The absence of any decentralised structures within the council, with the exception of Community Education Officers based on a range of inner city centres (L 66), tended to militate against continuous dialogue between local interests and the council. Hence some form of local party or community pressure tended to be needed to create the sporadic public debate that occurred in this case.

In summary it is considered that the local political and interest group conjuncture, and the spatial circumstances of the site, were both very

significant in making the specific local planning process and outcome in this case. But these fitted within the general approach to local planning which was sympathetic, especially in 1979-81, to public involvement and area frameworks. The varying availability of public and private investment also structured the process and outcome. The fact that the process included some local public involvement was, in itself, a factor influencing the outcome.

## 2. Other Residential Clearance Areas

### Course of Events

There is some contrast to the Bansteads episode in the treatment of the smaller clearance areas on the southern boundary of Harehills (see Map 6). These areas became smaller than proposed by the council, through the successful objection at the Inquiry in 1980 of a private Trust owning many of the houses in The Edgewares. The Development Plan Review had referred to possible open space as well as residential redevelopment on this boundary (L 1). The February 1979 planning report saw light industry, residential and land for the hospital as the main uses, though it suggested that if the hospital's needs were not firmed up, industry and open space would use this land on the southern most boundary (L 21). The arguments for these uses were presented in essentially technical terms, reflecting views on the proper location of uses given road noise, adjoining houses and discussions with the Area Health Authority on hospital needs. It was felt that the whole strip between Roseville Road and Gledhow Road represented a logical extension to the industrial area to the south, in case the Gledhows and Keplers should later be cleared.

These proposals were effectively confirmed in the report of April 1981, dividing the sites between 'industrial and similar' to the west, residential and (small areas of) public open space to the east (L 27). Subsequently in 1985 the residential site was sold to North British Housing Association to develop 60 houses for large Asian families and the elderly (L 55). On the other hand the main industrial allocations were not implemented, given, it seems, little commercial interest (L 62). One part of the site was agreed for allocation in 1983 as a replacement for Bankside Working



Men's Club (a longstanding requirement from earlier clearance on the other side of Roundhay Road); the most prominent local councillor was active at this stage on their behalf (L 54). The other part was due in June 1986 to be leased temporarily to the hospital for staff car parking (L 62). This reflected extensive local complaints concerning parking in the streets nearest the hospital after staff were excluded from parking within the hospital in 1984 (L 46).

There is only one piece of evidence suggesting any objections to these allocations; this is the reference in the report on Harehills by local Housing Aid Centre workers in 1984 (L 71) to "the steady encroachment of industrial land" (p 26). No other local groups or councillors appear to have seen the allocations as controversial.

### Processes

Although the allocations were known to those most involved in local groups, as well as to those caught up in the clearance areas, the process setting the uses remained primarily within the professional domain, reflecting judgements mainly of the Planning and Housing Departments. They were considered however within the framework for Harehills as a whole, through the 1979 and 1981 reports, balancing to some extent the open space use on the Bansteads site.

### Outcomes

The results followed on from the proposals, where investment could be made available, for housing, benefitting interests identified professionally as especially needy; the industrial allocations gave way to more pressing local demands from the displaced club and for hospital parking, both intruding into the area from outside but solving difficult problems for certain local interests. Finance was available for both purposes and development was therefore practical.

### Factors

In these cases it is considered that the process and outcomes reflected mainly the

investment situations affecting the proposals, the spatial location of the sites and the professional understandings of the two key departments. Public participation in the southern part of Harehills seems to have been rather limited, reflecting the lesser organisation in this area and the weakening effect of the clearance process. It is unlikely that there was much positive local support for the industrial proposals, but in the absence of any community or political opposition, officials had to a degree a free hand - though much influenced by factors in public policies well beyond local control - compensation for a club cleared some years before (L 54), Area Health Authority policy on security and access in hospitals (L 46). Nevertheless, the local pressure around the hospital parking problem and from club members did play significant roles as well.

Thus the 'normal' internal council mechanisms, occasionally intruded upon by councillor or resident pressure, within the area frameworks prepared up to 1981 but after that only very loosely within these, secured through relatively closed processes outcomes beneficial to at least some local interests. But the changing allocation of 1984-86 meant that this was in part accidental, reflecting the rather weak organisation of local interests and their limited institutional salience within the council.

### 3. Rank Optics

Before 1980 the Harehills study area contained one significant area of non-residential land uses, the industrial sites on either side of Harehills Lane. The largest site is considered here, the others in the following section in contrast. It is evident that the 'recycling' of industrial land raises quite different issues from that of residential land. Most of the laws and state policies affecting such property, as well as the economic structure within which it is developed and used, are distinct. In Ball's terms, as described in Chapter 3, the structure of provision is very different. This was very evident in the Rank Optics case.

#### Course of Events

The revised Development Plan showed part of the industrial land between the

former proposed North East Expressway and Harehills Lane for industrial redevelopment (L 1). Subsequently in 1972 a programme of industrial renewal and rehabilitation was approved by the Policy Committee; according to the Harehills/Gipton Appraisal (L 16) this programme left "a few small pockets of fairly modern industry" as unaffected "as they do not obtrude on nearby housing and are relatively innocuous uses" (L 16, p3). There thus existed in the 1970s a city-wide set of policies prepared on a technical/professional basis. After the abandonment of the Expressway scheme the council had no intention to take action on the industrial premises.

However the changes in the Leeds economy in the late 1970s led to the vacation of most of the premises in this area, with the largest firm, Rank Optics, leaving in 1980. The site, shown on Map 10, included a modern office building, a car park and older buildings; small, still mostly occupied, industrial premises and a few houses took up the remainder of the street block. Council policy favoured continued industrial use of the site and had a suitable user been found to take on the lease, the council would have doubtless remained uninvolved.

However, the ownership structure of the site was complex, involving a freehold held by the Peachey Property Corporation, a company with extensive regional interests and mortgages connecting this site with other premises, such that both they and Rank Optics were especially concerned to maximise development value of the site (L 31, L 39). The site therefore remained vacant and in early 1983 the owners were considering submitting a scheme for retail development.

In response to this possibility councillors called a public meeting in April 1983, when use for a superstore was opposed (L 43). The Harehills Action Group proposed community, training and industrial uses; a superstore was seen as a threat to existing corner shops, especially small Asian run businesses, and as intruding traffic and parking problems, as had been experienced in the Dodge City case nearby (see the following section) (L 66). In the meantime the newly formed Industry and Employment Department had, through its East Leeds Team, suggested acquisition of the site for training and workshop use. In response the Planning Department circulated departments for possible uses in mid 1982, with councillors

complaining about the increasingly vandalised state of the buildings at the end of 1982 (L 62). The result was a report to Planning and Development Committee in July 1983 which argued that a mixture of uses was preferable, including possibly housing, light industry, community facilities and amenity open space (L 31). It was argued that neither office nor shopping development could be supported on the site.

Between 1983 and 1986 the owners continued to push for retail use; a planning application was refused in June 1985 (L 43); an appeal due to be heard in mid 1986 was in the end deferred and then dropped. In the meantime the Planning Department had carried out much work on shopping in East Leeds, including a policy report in April 1986 (L 37) and this appears to have helped to resist superstore applications, suggesting to the site owners that the appeal would not succeed.

The council's negotiations to acquire the site however made no progress until 1987. It appeared impossible to break the deadlock which separated the valuations by each party. In late 1986 the Council approached the Minister responsible for the recently formed Chapeltown and Harehills Task Force, to see whether any central government intervention could help. In the end it is not clear what led to the breakthrough, and whether the Task Force or Minister had any part. Most likely, according to information from the valuer involved, for unknown reasons internal to the relationship between Rank Optics and the Peachey Corporation, the Corporation released the freehold to Ranks, after which the Council could easily buy the site (L 62).

By this time a wide range of possible uses for the site had been canvassed, primarily by the Industry & Employment Department (training and workshop) and Social Services Department (centre for the mentally handicapped, and a home and centre for the elderly) but also for a housing association scheme. Given the long gestation period premises had been sought elsewhere for the training projects and funds had not been forthcoming for the social schemes (L 39, L 62). However the acquisition of the site coincided with one very pressing need, for a replacement school site. The discovery of structural problems in two local primary schools led to a rapid search for land in early 1986, with one site identified on ex-allotments

land on the edge of Harehills. Given the high school rolls due to the above average Asian family birth rate, further sites were needed and the Rank Optics acquisition proved ideal, with completion of the school being achieved in 1989, using around half the 6 acre site (L 68A).

In this case local planning policy intersected with the city-wide process affecting schools investment. The need for replacement sites in Harehills had long been identified in planning documents, with sites shown in the revised Development Plan and mentioned in the Harehills/Gipton Appraisal in 1974 (L 16). But in preparing the Conways GIA scheme the Planning Department had obtained the Education Department's agreement to dropping these schemes. Nevertheless Education officials argued in 1978 that schools "may need to be replaced in the near future" (L 50) and in 1981 suggested the need to discuss sites for the two schools subsequently identified in 1986 as having structural problems (L 62).

After 1980 schools capital investment could be controlled more directly by the council (after changes via the Local Government, Planning and Land Act 1980), and the council embarked on a programme to replace two schools each year (rather than one as in earlier years). First this benefited South Leeds, but by 1986 leading councillors apparently considered East Leeds as due for treatment (L 64). Therefore there was a clear intersection of circumstances which facilitated the scheme using the Rank Optics site, helped by the activity of the local councillors and the interest of the council leader in the area; the latter interest stemmed in part from his chairmanship of the Chapeltown and Harehills Liaison Committee, set up after riots in the area in 1981, (L 33), and also from his wish, it is said, to obtain the parliamentary seat for North East Leeds when the current MP retires (L 62). The school allocation process was therefore strongly affected by city-wide and 'higher' political forces.

The use of the rest of the site was decided in a rather similar way. Before the leader of the council stood down, relatively suddenly, in 1987, he decided that three facilities for the Asian communities in Chapeltown and Harehills should be found. Funding was obtained from the IAP and the north part (2 acres) of the Rank Optics site was immediately allocated for a building for the Muslim Community

Association (for the Pakistani Muslims; a site for the 'Harehills Community Association', for Bangladeshi Muslims, was found on the old school site on the other side of Roundhay Road at the same time). Building was underway in 1989. The remainder of the site was informally allocated for a mosque, as a replacement for the group using part of the Harehills Place community building, but funds were not yet available within the Muslim community for this scheme (L 68A).

### Processes

To a large extent the decision making process took place between officials of the main development departments, though with the involvement of local councillors. Only at the time of the superstore application in 1983 was there much community response, beyond complaints about the deterioration of the buildings on the site. The size of the site, the large amount of finance involved, the importance of school investment decisions and the personal interest of the council leader then led to the lifting of the issue up to the highest council level - though this related in part to political pressures specific to the local Asian communities. Whilst officials were aware of the area frameworks discussed in 1979-81 there was no direct attempt to reopen the public debate about local needs. Instead decisions were in the end political, in conjunction with certain closely connected interest groups.

### Outcomes

The outcomes in this case benefited particularly the Asian communities, who formed an increasingly important part of the electorate and perhaps through their local organisation and normal attachment to the Labour Party had an especially significant access to local councillors. These outcomes reflected closely the final form of the decision making process, rather than the earlier inter-departmental or technical planning discussions, based on professional perceptions of local need. Nevertheless Education Department Officials, long aware of investment needs in the areas, were able to insert their understandings, from a city-wide programming perspective.

## Factors

- (a) The Rank Optics issue was decided at a time when local planning consisted mainly of strongly politicised inter-departmental networking, rather than heavy commitments to public debate or local plan making. It therefore reflected the city-wide local planning approach dominant at the time.
- (b) The availability of public funding, through intervention by the council leadership, was essential to the progress of development: that the schools capital programme could be directed at the time of acquisition to this scheme and that IAP funding could be made available. General city-wide policies on retail development were also significant.
- (c) The absence of private development interest, except for retailing, was a key underlying factor leading to council acquisition.
- (d) Officials were influential in raising the issue of possible uses in 1982-3, but, except for those in the Education Department who had long favoured replacements for the Harehills Schools, had little influence on the final allocations.
- (e) Local councillors were at first involved to an important extent, particularly in opposing retail use, but in 1986-87 the council leadership, particularly the leader, had the most central role.
- (f) The spatial location and potential externality effects imposed some constraints on development, although restricting only the more intrusive or traffic generating uses. The large size of the site encouraged consideration of multiple uses, and the absence of comparable areas in the district put the site's use at a premium.
- (g) The relatively weak organisation of most interests in the area during this period and the limited public 'visibility' of the issue (compared with housing clearance for example) meant that local councillors and the most continuously

active groups (in the Muslim communities) were the leading local actors, though dependent on the council leadership.

- (h) The absence of decentralised forms, other than the East Leeds Team of the Industry and Employment Department, tended to encourage city-wide decision making processes, within departmental and professional channels rather than on an area basis.

In this case therefore the council's political leadership was decisive, in that it could, to a large extent, control the relevant public programmes and policies for the benefit of certain selected interests. This meshed with the variable level of local organisation and the limited private investment pressure. The long drawn out character of the process resulted from the complexity of ownership forms particular to this case, blocking public acquisition and thus 'recycling' of the site.

#### 4. Other Industrial Sites

##### Ashton Road Site

##### Course of Events

Premises adjoining the Rank Optics site, previously a small clothing factory, were by 1978 derelict (see Map 6). In the Conways GIA declaration report in June 1978 public comments were particularly directed against the state of this building, as well as calling for a children's play area (L 50). At first officers suggested a play street in the improvement scheme for the area, but this was rejected by residents (L 63). The proposal to acquire the industrial site, agreed by the Planning and Development Committee in December 1978, arose directly from the GIA discussions and local pressure, including from an IAP ward meeting and from the Area Community Education Officer. An application had been made by a local group for Urban Aid funds for an adventure playground (L 50).

However the acquisition proposal suggested that the site be split between a play area and industrial units. The latter element stemmed partly from the arguments of the Industry and Estates Department officials that acquisition just for play use would



be too expensive, given the industrial value of the site, and partly from the most active local (Conservative) councillor that there was a need for a site to relocate non conforming uses from Chapeltown (L 50). In this case therefore one department's viewpoint coalesced with that of the councillor most involved in the GIA discussions.

Public participation of the environmental scheme followed in 1979, including a competition on design of the play area for local schools, and the play area was part of the first phase of the GIA environmental works, implemented with IAP funding in 1981 (L 24). The industrial units were built by the council the following year. Whilst, according to the most active councillor elected in 1980 (L 61) there were some objections from residents to the play area, fearing disturbance, he felt that the problems had been limited. He also felt the units had been successful and hoped for more, possibly on the Rank Optics site.

### Processes

Because of an available mechanism in the GIA scheme consultation, the decisions on site use were taken within a relatively public process. Nevertheless after the first pressures of 1978 there seems to have been only limited resident involvement in the area, and after the end of 1978 the schemes were essentially worked up by officers. The role of the local councillor was significant in pushing for industrial units.

### Outcomes

The results reflect a mixture of local and citywide influences, with the play area broadly favoured locally and the industrial units pressed more by wider departmental and political interests. Nevertheless the compromise of splitting the site appears to have been acceptable to residents; at any rate the rather low key public involvement permitted this result, probably essentially agreed at officer and councillor level.

## Factors

The GIA scheme process, operating somewhat separately from local planning in general, was significant in creating for a while a forum where the play issue could be raised. It also provided a route to programme funding. The absence of private industrial demand for the premises was as always important. The nature of the site limited possibilities, although the fact that such a small area was split into two parts shows that this was only a slight constraint. The relatively weakly organised local public and the absence of a locally institutionalised council presence no doubt both reduced the control of residents over the scheme, allowing officials and councillors considerable leeway after the initial play area pressure.

Thus, as often, it is evident that a very complex joint operation of these factors was necessary to secure the particular outcome emerging four years after GIA declaration.

## 'Dodge City' Site

### Course of Events

This site is on the east side of Harehills Lane, opposite the Rank Optics land (see Map 11). After the wallpaper factory closed, the site was bought by developers in 1979 and planning permission was obtained in February 1980 for a DIY store and garden centre, subject to a Section 52 agreement restricting use to this purpose. The store was developed and operated by 'Dodge City'. Following a change in the ownership of this firm, the owners made an informal approach in May 1982 to change the use to a food supermarket. This was turned down by Planning and Development Committee Appointed Members in June 1982 (L 30). The freeholders continued to push the issue, still arguing in July 1985 that the impact would be less than the existing use (L 48B). But a planning application was turned down in 1985 for this change, on the grounds of impact within a high-density residential area, especially through traffic generation (L 37).

The store had caused considerable local complaints, to both city and county

councils, because of noise, opening hours and damage to property, with a petition of residents in adjoining roads submitted via a local councillor in May 1982. One councillor elected in May 1980 was mystified as to how the site obtained the permission (L 61), and officers in the local planning and development control sections and in County Highways were in agreement that a poor decision had been made (L 48B). However there is no evidence of any local objections to the application before it was permitted.

### Processes

In this case, on a site outside the Harehills Triangle where most local planning interest was centred, one sees first of all a 'normal' development control decision, guided primarily by the professional planners. This was succeeded by some opening up of the process via public complaints and perhaps more active local councillors. This helped to support the decisions in 1982 and 1985 against change of use. Officials in both county and city councils were agreed that intensification was undesirable, from normal technical-professional points of view; thus the attitudes of residents, councillors and officials allowed an effective coalition which was sufficient to oppose any deterioration of the situation, though not extensive enough to remove the existing problems (which would have required the council to purchase and seek a more acceptable use).

### Outcomes

The outcomes were, evidently, first problematic and then somewhat more favourable for local residents, and the reverse for the store operators and freeholder. The processes outlined above contributed to each of these outcomes, first in the closed process of the first application, then in the more politicised and open forum of the second - although a very much greater level of public pressure would presumably have been necessary to remove the problems altogether.

### Factors

The fact that the site lay outside the informal area framework (and not within a

GIA or HAA) and that the East Leeds Local Plan was not progressed significantly after its formal beginning in 1982, meant that consideration of a site such as this arose within city-wide policies and, under the circumstances of the case, within development control mechanisms - 'local planning' meant mainly development control responses, though backed by 1985-86 by extensive consideration of retailing in East Leeds (L 37).

The main forces driving the issue were the private investment pressure, seeking improved returns from the site, and the responses of local residents to the negative externalities from the scheme, once these became evident; the low level of organisation locally was no doubt partly responsible for the initial approval and the limited success in reducing the problems subsequently arising. The overall structuring of the relations affecting retail and industrial development made the situation a difficult one for both residents and officials to deal with, as was evident in a different way in the Rank Optics case.

## 5. Changes from Religious Use

The analysis of the main land use changes in this area is completed here with two sites in religious ownership.

### Trinity Methodist Church

This site, on Roundhay Road/Banstead Terrace corner (see Map 6), was redeveloped in the early 1980s as a new church and a sheltered housing scheme developed by a housing association. The decision was uncontroversial and proceeded through 'normal' processes of development control and public funding of the housing scheme. Neither its location nor uses raised issues which were problematic, either for significant local community and political interests or for officials in the relevant departments.

### St Augustine's RC School Site

After this school was closed, planning permission was obtained, in 1978, for a

housing association to develop the site (L 45) (see Map 6). Subsequently the council decided to purchase the site for a sheltered housing scheme. However, the scheme ran into difficulties when competing users emerged, for retail and then religious use. These were both opposed by local residents and planning applications were refused. After the May 1980 elections the new councillors (including local members and the council leader) decided that religious groups should have first chance to buy the site and permission was granted for a religious centre (L 26, L 50). But the main Muslim group interested was unable to raise the relatively small sum involved to purchase (L 67). The council decided again to buy the land for housing use; construction occurred finally in 1985-86, for sheltered housing.

The council's preference for housing use for the elderly was evidently crosscut in 1980 by Labour councillors' desire to help local Asian groups. Though within the Conways GIA, the issue was not therefore effectively resolved within that framework. The location of the site, as well as inter-ethnic tensions, did not favour a use which could be seen as disturbing to adjoining residents. The ability to make funding available for the housing scheme contrasted with the Muslim group's lack of finance - and the fact that the council did not offer to pay for a community building, as it did seven years later in the Rank Optics case.

In this case then the difficulty of the issues raised by Asian groups seeking sites or premises, in a highly built up area, led to a politically tortuous process, but one which led back to the use which most easily fitted into all the conditioning circumstances - and especially favoured by the key officials.

## 6. Analysis and Summary of Harehills Cases

Given the importance of considering all the factors influencing processes and outcomes in combination, it is not simple to present a summary analysis of the cases described above. This difficulty also results from the variety in the cases, which reduces the possibility of making generalisations between different parts of the process. On one level this variety is evident between the three different initial uses, residential, industrial and religious/social. The transition both from these uses and to the new uses involved differing structures of provision, in which several of the factors analysed were implicated.

Thus the first phase of the originally residential cases consisted of the specificities of the clearance process, with certain rights and powers attached to the different actors. In the other cases public acquisition entailed negotiation with private owners, normally on a voluntary basis, and 'recycling' of the sites sometimes remained in the private or at least non-municipal sector, as in the Dodge City and Methodist Church cases. No public rights of involvement were available in these cases, except through the limited control given by consultation on planning applications for change of use. There was therefore a more straightforward route to public control in the residential cases, at least in the clearance phase.

Beyond this three-way split, an analytical summary will be made here through the examination of four issues: the effect of the citywide local planning approaches in each period, the significance of area frameworks, the factors governing the extent of public involvement, and the relationship between the local planning process and outcomes. These will be followed by a brief conclusion.

- (a) Citywide local planning approaches affected local processes to a major extent. The cases surveyed here are all concentrated in the period after 1978, although based in some cases on clearance decisions earlier. Therefore only the two later periods of general approaches are relevant. The general openness to public involvement and readiness to use area frameworks in 1978-82 is evident in all the cases within the Harehills Triangle, although the Ashton Road site was considered primarily within the GIA process. The cases decided later (parts of the residential clearance sites on the southern boundary and the Rank Optics case) reflected the more politicised networking of key officials and councillors which was more characteristic from 1982 onwards. However the process in each case could not be read off directly from the city-wide approach, being influenced significantly by local circumstances, especially of group and party political organisation.
- (b) Area frameworks had only a limited influence in the period between 1971 and 1978, when the provisions of the revised Development Plan became generally inoperative and, despite intended moves in the direction of plan making (eg the 1974 Appraisal), no new frameworks were made. The

decisions on the abandonment of the major shopping, schools and road schemes and of full redevelopment were all taken without any local planning framework, essentially between 1973 and 1975. Between 1978 and 1981 the two Harehills Triangle reports and the GIA scheme provided vehicles for a to some degree area oriented set of decisions, primarily on the residential clearance area land use decisions. However the account of the five cases during these years showed that only some elements of the decision making were held within these processes. The decision on St Augustine's school site was lifted out of the GIA scheme, which had seen it as a housing site, when councillors wished to permit a religious centre. The same happened later with the clearance areas in the south of the district. In reality the area reports were only stages within a process extending outside the making of particular frameworks, stills within a film which moved on fairly rapidly after each report was approved. Only during 1979-81 did the process of preparing the reports allow fuller consideration of the interrelations between the different parts of the local jigsaw. The same applied to the GIA scheme, which could deal with the Ashton Road site but not with the school site, and even less with the soon to emerge Rank Optics issue. It should be noted that the 1981 report covered a larger area than that of 1979, but in practice this extension across to Harehills Lane made little difference, as the major issue within the area, the Rank Optics site, was not ripe for council consideration. The committee report of September 1980 (L 24) and the first draft of the 1981 report (L 26) both proposed annual Progress Reports to keep councillors and the public informed on progress and to deal with new issues. The April 1981 report (L 27) only had a commitment to publish Progress Reports "when necessary", and none were in fact prepared. Therefore the difference between the sites considered within area oriented frames and the Dodge City site dealt with outside such a form should not be exaggerated. The absence of a framework for the Dodge City site mattered, leaving it to be treated in a routine development control framework, but even within the Triangle area some decisions were taken in a similar ad hoc manner, responding to immediate political and community pressures. The limited commitment to local plan making in effect allowed 'continuous local planning' to emerge frequently, against any attempts to set land use futures at particular moments. Often this was project by project, not area

planning.

The same point applies with greater force to the attempts at statutory plan making, which hardly figured in the above accounts. Though the East Leeds Local Plan was announced in 1982 (L 29), it was always seen as a document dealing essentially with the outer areas of the city, and was for that purpose held back throughout the 1980s by an absence of decisions on major road schemes. Only in the consideration of shopping policies did the East Leeds Plan partially intrude on the Rank Optics and Dodge City cases; and even here the policy review (L 37) was only loosely related to Local Plan preparation. The Local Planning section head's opinion that statutory plan making had no significance in the Leeds inner areas (L 9) was based on experience such as that in Harehills.

- (c) Public involvement in these cases varied considerably even within the phases of each. It naturally depended in part on the extent to which each contained controversial elements, which in turn depended on the spatial location of the sites, the proposals and the social relations and organisation of nearby interests. Only on five occasions was there evidence of major public interest and involvement: briefly in the Ashton Road site as a play area, for a considerable period in the Bansteads, in objections to the religious use of the school site, to the DIY store and proposed foodstore at Dodge City, and to the proposed foodstore at Rank Optics. These reveal only a limited ability for continuing expression of local interests in the area, though also in favour of open space or play areas. Despite some openness on the part of planners to public participation, and local councillors' responsiveness to local pressure (probably more so after 1980), several decisions reflected mainly the views of officials or of councillors operating within the council leadership - the first phase of the Dodge City case, the industrial element of the Ashton Road Site, much of the work up to late 1980 on the Bansteads, later decisions on the southern clearance area sites. Where public involvement in some form was more significant, this was the result of either a strong push on one issue - particularly on open space - by a relatively small number of residents, or a response to a perceived threat, or the mobilisation of an already organised interest - in the 1980s most evidently Muslims in



the district. In the terms of the social bases of organisation considered in Chapter 3, the importance of ethnicity is evident. Probably before the 1980s it served to reduce the force of local response through the unsettling effect of people moving in and out of the district, whilst later, under more propitious political circumstances, it contributed to a more active pressure locally.

This pressure was supported by the 1981 riots, even though these sprang mainly from adjoining Chapeltown, and by the current in the Labour Party in favour of positive discrimination for the black communities - even though no local councillors were black.

That more public involvement did not occur was due partly to this uneven local activity and partly to the often unfavourable structuring of provision. It was very hard for residents to be involved over years on complex issues of land use, especially where as in the mainly private sector industrial and retail sphere, council control was restricted.

The absence of any decentralised form of council working almost certainly reinforced weakness amongst some local interests and their ability to achieve favoured outcomes, leaving the strongest organisation in the best position.

Outside the Muslim communities women were prominent in organising, both the mothers on the play space issue and generally through the prime organiser of the Liaison Group (L 66). In the period 1973-79 the main people active in the Community Association were also women, particularly a local shopkeeper (L 66); they were mainly older and were especially active in pressing for a community centre, primarily with the needs of the elderly in mind. This 'gendering' of local action no doubt both affected the issues raised and made the impact lesser on occasions, given the generally male domination of the council, in terms of both officials and councillors. At the same time the mainly low income character of Harehills both affected its political character as a Labour ward after 1980, and no doubt reduced public involvement, except on certain occasions where crosscut by consumption

sector issues, such as the rising owner occupation levels in the district.

- (d) The link between processes and outcomes was mediated by the same factors which governed the variable forms of processes; the link was therefore both loose and variable. It is true that there was a greater tendency for very locally oriented interests to achieve outcomes satisfactory to themselves where public discussion had occurred and local councillors felt that they should support these interests - in the Ashton Road play area, the Bansteads open space and the opposition to major foodstore proposals. The decisions favouring Muslim groups reached up beyond local councillors to the council leadership, given their organisation and perceived electoral importance - in this case through relatively closed interest group interactions rather than open public discussion. The multiplicity of potential interests, local and not so local (eg for sheltered housing or for industrial units), meant that where officials controlled decisions to a major extent, they normally represented some interest with at least local connections. And sometimes, given the structuring of provision working against local control (as in the Dodge City case and, for many years, in Rank Optics), local interests were not favoured, despite efforts by the council to work to their advantage. All of these factors reduced the directness of process and outcome linking.

One can therefore make an initial summary of the connection of process and outcome by saying that the tendency to firmness in the link was highly dependent on the structural, spatial, political and organisational circumstances of the case. Only if the circumstances so permitted would for example the formula "public involvement favoured outcomes helpful to major local interests" hold.

### Conclusion

In the Harehills cases as a whole then one can see a local planning process set partly by the citywide approach and by factors operating at 'higher' levels. Local residents only secured influence in a limited number of episodes, leaving planners with some scope at times to manage issues as they preferred - if local or leading

leading councillors so permitted.

There was thus a complex interaction between the 'structural' forces setting the scope for movement and the contingencies of the area, not least the particular physical or locational features of each of the cases. Both processes and outcomes were created by this interaction. Overall the structural constraints are most evident on most occasions, against very local 'causal' factors. Only occasionally did the weakness of these structural forces create the space for the local interests to have some influence.

#### **D Planning Episodes in Richmond Hill**

The context for planning in Richmond Hill differed from that in Harehills, as the area sketch suggested, especially in two respects. Firstly the district was at a more advanced stage of redevelopment, at least in its western part, reflecting its nearness to the city centre and the earlier construction of the area. The eastern section, East End Park, was more recent and more similar to parts of Harehills. This different position within the redevelopment or renewal process resulted in a distinct planning phase and a varying form of the main issues arising in the period after the early 1970s. Secondly local community interests and organisation were different from those in Harehills, producing distinct local politics. The combination of these two differences, of issues and local forces, served to generate a different kind of local planning process. This process consisted primarily of a detailing and occasional alteration of the Development Plan Revision allocations, rather than extensive revision. The episodes or issues selected here for detailed examination will reflect this. The first concerns the major issue likely to change the Development Plan, the road line crossing the southern part of the district. The second case involves the detailing and implementation of the 'local centre' proposals in the western part of the area. Thirdly the overall progressing of the main housing, open space and school allocations will be discussed; these are more akin to 'non-episodes' and the

aim is to examine the relative stability of these proposals over many years. Analysis of these cases will be followed by a concluding summary which will draw out further the contrasts and structuring of variation, compared to Harehills.

## 1. The Cross Green Route

### Course of Events

There had been a proposal for an 'East Leeds Radial Route' under one name or another for many years. In the early 1960s the 'Halton Expressway' had been planned to pass through both Richmond Hill and Halton (L 108). Residents in the higher income areas of Halton objected and the road line was moved in that section, but remained in Richmond Hill, as can be seen in the Development Plan Revision submitted in 1968. Map 8 shows part of this Plan, with the Inner Ring Road route running along the west of the area, on lower ground next to the city centre, and a major road coming off the ring road and running east through part of the area to be cleared in Richmond Hill (the site of the Pretorias) and then south of East End Park. This proposal fitted within the overall highway planning of Leeds, dominated by the City Engineer (later Director of Technical Services, until retirement in 1974), and made feasible by the full redevelopment proposed by the Plan in Richmond Hill.

The proposal was inherited by the West Yorkshire County Council and was not to be altered until 1981. One reason suggested by a Leeds planner for this long period was that the Highways Department was strong in the County Council and many engineers there had moved from the city council in 1974; there was thus a great reluctance to abandon the partly completed network (L 112). This network to an extent imposed its own timescale, as the inner ring road sections adjoining Richmond Hill were programmed for implementation earlier and their precise line was therefore resolved in 1978-79. The Radial Route on the other hand depended in part on a decision on the M1-A1 link east of Leeds, an issue of great complexity and controversy which remained unresolved in 1986. Even in 1979 the Radial Route was not expected to be constructed before 1985-86 (L 83). Therefore in the first years of the County Council's life the Route was not seen as of such high

priority for review.

This was not the viewpoint of some residents. The Cross Green Action Group was set up in June 1974 (L 94), primarily to oppose the road proposal. The main active resident lived in one of the houses due to be demolished by the road, and his persistence was essential in providing a sporadic but just visible opposition to the proposal up to 1980 (L 108). In that year an adult education worker moved into Cross Green and became the leading organiser of opposition to the road scheme. She considered that several factors led to the weakness of local residents in dealing with the threat from the road, including the complexities of highways planning, the normal unresponsiveness of engineers in providing explanations and information and the spatially and socially divided nature of Richmond Hill, after years of clearance and blight (L 108).

In 1978 a joint working group of city and county officials was set up to consider the route, including its land use effects (L 98). This was the spur to the decision to prepare an Appraisal of Richmond Hill, linked to the prospect of Urban Programme monies, should the district be chosen as a Priority Area (L 80). The Appraisal was expected to be a joint exercise of Local Planning and Implementation sections with consultation with Industry and Estates and Housing Departments (L 80). In August 1978 a Brief for the 'Planning Exercise' was prepared, noting that a committee report should be produced by the end of the year, with the possibility of public consultation after that. In fact the Appraisal was approved by Committee in February 1979 (L 83).

Whilst the Inner Ring Road route details were fixed, the Cross Green Route remained in the Appraisal where it had always been. The Appraisal therefore only partly achieved its objectives in this major respect, as Leeds planners considered that this route was detrimental to the local planning of the area: it cut off Cross Green from the rest of the district, was expensive (through the proposal to put the road in a cutting), removed a well known public house and created traffic management problems elsewhere in the area, as well as removing land directly from housing or open space use (L 111). In effect the issue was shelved, whilst Leeds

planners concentrated on issues that could be resolved in the meantime, particularly through treatment of vacant land and provision of community facilities.

In September 1979 the Urban Programme Priority Area report still contained the Pretorias route (L 88), whilst by June 1980 it was stated that the County Council was looking at a possible route through the Cross Green Industrial Estate. Finally in August 1981 the county engineers undertook a public participation exercise, with a local exhibition, offering a choice of three routes (see Map 9) (L 112). At this stage the northern (Pretorias) route was definitely abandoned; the county chose a route between Cross Green School and the industrial estate (L 91) - one favoured by city planners but not by some local residents (L 112).

Now more fully informed on highways planning issues, some residents argued that no road was needed, given other possible transport and land use decisions, whilst others favoured the county's 'southern' route and the removal of the secondary effects on the district by the closing of Ivy Street (the exit to York Road, the next radial northwards) (L 108, L 112). City councillors took note of these arguments and formally adopted a position in favour of the southern route (L 111). Both the central and the southern routes in any case removed the route, to a major extent, from the area. With the help of the local community worker (appointed in 1980 under the IAP initiative) the main activists in Cross Green continued efforts to stop or divert the Inner Ring Road and the Radial Route, managing to attract 40 residents to one stage of the Public Inquiry on part of the Ring Road in 1983. Local arguments may also have contributed to the county losing one stage of the Inquiry as well (L 108). Therefore the issue was kept to some extent live up to 1986 - and later, given that the issue remained unsolved in 1989.

### Processes

The greater part of the planning process of the Cross Green Route was subject to little local control and influence. The original route was set primarily by traffic engineers and planning officials within a closed bureaucratic process. It was retained by the same forces within the same process until 1978-79, although with occasional calls emerging from the opposing local group. From 1978 this group

could count on support from city planners and eventually in 1981 the process became somewhat more open, with the consultation exercise organised by the county council. The Public Inquiries for Stages V & VI of the Inner Ring Road kept some degree of public debate available for local interests in 1983-84. However throughout the period there were only limited 'handles' with which forces outside the core of officials and leading politicians could move into the process of decision making.

In particular it may be noted that though the 1979 Appraisal constituted an area-oriented framework prepared by local planners, it was not able to exert a decisive influence over the major issue in the district. Nor was it an element of an open decision making process, as it was prepared by officials. Subsequently during 1979 discussions were held with at least one local resident, the veteran of the Cross Green Action Group, here representing the Richmond Hill Advisory Group (a body mainly formed by local teachers, priests and other 'welfare' employees, in existence 1976-80) - the topic being IAP schemes (L 87). But it is clear that public discussion did not reach very far at this stage.

### Outcomes

The eventual lifting of the blighting effect from Cross Green in 1981 constituted an improvement for local residents. But the lengthy period the proposal had existed (since at least the mid 1960s) and the continued uncertainty about the secondary effects on traffic through the area after 1981 were both results of the planning process which were damaging for most interests in the Richmond Hill area. These reflected to a significant extent the process of 'remote control' described above.

### Factors

- (a) The city-wide local planning approaches are reflected to varying extents in each period. Before 1974 the closed processes of Development Plan revision and then in 1972-73 of the work on a proposed 'Interim District Plan' both followed the general pattern. The potential openings of 1974-76 touched the area as little as they did Harehills, given the absence of planning issues

which officials perceived at that stage.

The potential for a more localised and open process that the planning frameworks of 1978-81 suggested was only very partially realised in Richmond Hill. This was due partly to the limited public pressure for involvement, and partly to the restricted issues and the difficulty of controlling the issue that was most central - the Radial Route. The ad hoc and politicised management of issues after 1981-82 was perhaps more directly reflected, in the council leadership's support for the southern route, responding to local pressures.

- (b) The programming of both transport and housing spending influenced this issue, with the slow down in roads investment delaying the need for decision, and the eventual availability of housing funds (particularly in the post 1980 Labour council) encouraging the release of land for residential use, supporting local rehousing from clearance in Richmond Hill.
- (c) Given the public funding of road building there was no direct effect from private investment levels.
- (d) Professional engineers and to a lesser extent planners controlled the discussion of the route for most of the period, though greater local community and political involvement emerged in the early 1980s.
- (e) Local councillors were at least until the election of a Liberal in 1978 not very active in the area. The most active Labour councillor considered in 1986 that the road was necessary from a broader city planning viewpoint and that the only issue was to keep it as clear as possible of houses (L 109). After 1978 local councillors helped to channel local discontent on some occasions, leading to the 1981 county decision, but in the end direct links to the council leadership may have been more effective in the council's support for the southern route (L 108). Labour councillors appear to have regarded community action as linked to Liberal activity, in contrast to



Harehills (L 109, L 110).

- (f) The damaging effects of the original route were grasped by city planners especially in terms of their spatial effects; clearly the perceptions of the 'externality field' of such a major route were equally uppermost in the minds of some residents - but depending on where they lived in relation to the proposal, these might seem serious or marginal. Only considered coordination by 'coalition builders', such as the community worker appointed in 1980 and the resident moving into Cross Green at the same time, could to some extent bring together such varying perceptions, based on more complete or specific information.
- (g) The limited opening of the decision making process and the variable outcomes were testimony to the two sides of local social relations in Richmond Hill: limited local organisation except through the normally inert channels of the churches and the Labour Party, but sufficient scattered individuals, and for a few years around 1978 significant Liberal activity, such that opposition to the road scheme was on occasion organised and local voices were heard, in consultation exercises and Public Inquiries. This limited local activity was supported by a range of to a degree 'outside' forces - the Anglican and Catholic churches at certain times, the Area Community Education Officer (active in the Advisory Group 1976 to 1980) and the community worker appointed in 1980. In November 1980 the Richmond Hill Community Group was formed, other than the Cross Green Action Group apparently the first such body of local residents in the area (L 113, Evening Post 13/11/1980).

Although without a decentralised structure (except in housing management after 1985), the fact that several agencies had localised arms, as noted above, helped to support local action .

In this case the most notable feature is the way in which the local weakness, born of local divisions and the clearance process, combined with the structured tendency in such major road issues, led to remote and

professionalised decision making. The absence of any formal plan making process over a wider area (in spite of the proposed East Leeds Plan from 1982) reinforced the difficulty for local interests. Under these circumstances the securing of some local influence represented a significant achievement, very likely based partly on the threat posed by the Liberals in the area from 1978 onwards, sensitising Labour councillors more to local voices.

## 2. The Local Centre

### Course of Events

The Development Plan Revision indicated symbolically a location for local shops in the centre of the western part of Richmond Hill. In 1972 a proposal for 3 municipal shops was approved within the Housing Capital Programme, as part of the Long Close Lane housing scheme due in 1975-76 (L 74). A detailed note prepared in the Planning and Property Department in December 1972 analysed the need for shops in the area (L 74). It notes that in 1971 there had been 179 shops in Richmond Hill (a reduction already on earlier levels, given clearance already completed) and that after clearance there would be 47 shops remaining in 1986, nearly all in Ivy Street at the eastern end of the area. It was argued that preliminary work for the Interim District Plan for Richmond Hill/Osmondthorpe (an exercise never formally completed - L 77) had suggested a case for a "community focal point for the area comprising a concentration of shopping and community facilities" (L 74 p3). The recently built Methodist Church and the Conservative Club would be joined by a projected Aged Persons Home and perhaps a relocation of York Road library. In terms of shops it was suggested that around 10 shops, including all basic daily needs, would be required. It was recommended that urgent investigation be undertaken to establish the practicality of this proposal.

It is striking that this thinking, although apparently not progressed within a plan or committee report, set the approximate form of the proposed centre for the next 15 years, although with significant variations at certain stages. The features of different elements will be traced through over the years, but the basic formula, stemming from planning officers' work in the early 1970s, was retained. Furthermore

variations and implementation remained primarily in officials' hands.

In 1974 Planning and Property Department discussion of the Local Centre recognised that most of the development would be long term; it was argued that site options should be kept open; preliminary discussions had led to possible site needs for a health centre and a social services centre. It was stated that "This section has firmly resisted pressure from the City Architect to release part of this area for housing" (L 77).

In February 1978 preliminary discussion of the Richmond Hill Planning Exercise noted: "Local Centre not firmly committed but still intended" (L 80). Population loss had reduced demand and made it hard to get the Shopping Centre off the ground, it was argued; other options of retaining local shops or providing corner shops might be considered. The Local Centre site might be too large, it was suggested, and might provide land for local rehousing.

But in the February 1979 appraisal only "a series of small shops with the possibility of a small supermarket" were proposed in the Local Centre; it was proposed that a planning brief be prepared to encourage "completion of the longstanding Local Centre proposal" (L 83). A series of meetings with other departments and public agencies (and in one case a local resident) followed to work up proposals for the Urban Programme. By 1981 it was noted that the old people's home, a day centre for the elderly, a community centre and a children's play area had been completed (L 103).

Progress notes on the Appraisal in June 1980 remarked that "approaches to the private sector for a small shopping development have not proved encouraging, and it is likely that a Council scheme tuned to coincide with the demolition of the Berthas' corner shops opposite the local centre site would be necessary to achieve this aim" (L 89). The Planning Brief for the Local Centre was approved by Committee in June 1981 (see Map 12, for plan in report). It argued for six retail units, and possibly a small supermarket, and proposed moving the existing play area, releasing part of the site for housing development. It noted that a shopping survey carried out by local residents in 1978 had argued the need for a supermarket

in the area (L 90).

After the brief there was, it seems, little further action on the shops issue. A report to Property Sub-committee in March 1986 stated that there had been no takers for the site in recent years and it was now to be advertised on a 125 year lease (L 106). As in the 1980s it was council policy not to build shops (L 111), this was the only practical course of action. Given that the Compulsory Purchase Order for the housing area opposite (including several shops) was approved in 1986, it was felt that the time was at last ripe. Residents in the Richmond Hill Clearance Action Group, formed in 1985 to press for responsive clearance of these nearby houses, argued the need for a shops scheme to replace those lost (L 97). A new layout was prepared by planners in May 1986 to assist marketing, including space for a doctor's surgery, to be moved from nearby premises (see Map 13). It showed the housing manager's office, provided as part of the 1985 Housing Department decentralisation, and a day nursery. The latter was probably due mainly to the local councillor who chaired the Nurseries Committee (L 109). In addition in 1986 a proposal was progressing for a Homeless Persons Unit on the land redesignated in 1981 as a housing site; there was no local opposition to this scheme, unlike in other areas - whether due to local sympathy for the homeless, or to apathy/poor information in the area, is not clear (L 111).

### Processes

It is evident that the main procedures for the local centre's planning and implementation were within the council, first amongst planners, then between planners and service departments. Only sporadically, as at the time of the Appraisal in 1978-79, was there some public pressure, over new shops - the same issue was raised again in 1985. Locally based 'welfare professionals' had a role in the decisions on social facilities, first within the Richmond Hill Advisory Group and then from late 1980 in the Community Group, which involved local residents to a more significant extent via community centre activities. Local councillors had some role in the 1980s, in supporting further facilities such as the day nursery.

## Outcomes

The range of social facilities provided between 1976 and 1986 was finally of considerable value to a range of local interests - especially the elderly and those with young children. Only perhaps the homeless persons' unit, likely to benefit Leeds residents generally rather than mainly local residents, and the failure to progress the shops element, represented failures from the point of view of immediate local interests. It can be argued that council officials, linked to local 'welfare professionals', interpreted local needs capably, in the absence of significant local pressure.

## Factors

- (a) In a way similar to the first case but even more pronounced, the more open and area oriented approach to local planning in Leeds in 1978-82 had limited effect in the local centre case. The city-wide approach mainly had influence in involving more local professionals in detailing and implementation of the welfare projects, but little effect on the shops proposal. No doubt a more locally responsive set of outcomes was however achieved in this way, as against the centrally controlled process of the early 1970s. The more politicised approach of the 1980s was reflected at least in the day nursery scheme secured with local councillor support.
- (b) The inner area programme was centrally important in securing a number of local schemes; equally the policy of not providing municipal shops blocked this possible solution to this issue.
- (c) Private retail developers' disinterest in the area governed the difficulties affecting the shops scheme.
- (d) Officials in the central departments of the council, linked to an extent to locally based community workers, were the main influences in the case at most times. Planners felt at times that Estates officials were uninterested in encouraging the shops scheme (L 111).

- (e) Local Councillors normally provided at most only backing for schemes worked up by officials.
- (f) The location of the centre within a redevelopment context meant that immediate externality issues were not significant.
- (g) Despite occasional pressure on local shops provision, the relative weakness of local organisation restricted the role of local interests in this case, although the general discontent evidenced in the Liberal successes after 1978 and some support for the Community Group after 1980 both helped to highlight the area and encourage investment in local centre facilities.
- (h) As in the Cross Green Route case, the presence of some locally based officials, though not as influential as a decentralised council structure could have been, did help local articulation of views to some extent.

In this case one sees particularly clearly the importance of the different structuring of the welfare and retail elements, which moved at quite different paces and subject to different processes - and different outcomes. The more locally oriented city-wide local planning approach from the late 1970s did not, in the absence of local pressure or strong political intervention, have the effect of changing these distinct structurings.

### 3. Housing, Open space and School Allocations

#### Course of Events

Rather than seek to analyse all the remaining allocations in the district, the aim here is to note the few variations from the Development Plan Revision proposals, understand the reasons for these and why the plan was in general adhered to. The main variation was the same as in Harehills - the greater housing retention, with most of the eastern section (East End Park), Cross Green and even a few streets in the western section agreed for retention between 1974 and 1979 (L 10). The one

area of clearance in the eastern section, East Park Mount, was agreed in 1978. The Public Inquiry saw a divided set of residents, with one resident apparently very supportive of clearance and others opposing (L 110, L 98). What Environmental Health officials had intended as the first of several clearance areas became the only one, mainly due to Housing Department's views that local rehousing was not possible (L 102).

These retention decisions evidently reduced land use decision making. Where clearance took place as in East Park Mount, housing was simply programmed to fill the space (L 111). In the case of the change in the Cross Green Route the response was equally uncontroversial, only releasing more housing land along the route. Where a school scheme change released a housing area, this was soon declared a Housing Action Area, in 1978, again with no land use change (L 79). School system changes in the area were complex, given the mosaic of Church of England and Roman Catholic, as well as non-denominational, schools. But in essence the closure of several smaller schools and the refurbishment or rebuilding of those remaining caused no difficulties, given the availability of sufficient land. Extra playing field space was allocated to two schools, as proposed in the Development Plan Revision, but with the difference that these became open spaces available for community use, thus adding to the existing open space of East End Park.

All of these variations reflected primarily central council policy changes - on housing, schools, open space, even though they had to be spatially tuned by officers to local circumstances. There was considerable community and political interest in the programming of clearance and rebuilding; this was a prime theme of Advisory Group discussions, especially in 1976-78, and a central root of Liberal success (L 94). But this did not involve local (re)planning in any extensive sense and thus is not treated here.

The continued adherence to Development Plan proposals, in most cases, reflected in part the high generality of these allocations - to housing use for large parts of the district for example. It also resulted from the simpler pattern of retention and clearance (broadly, a cleared west and retained east), and the higher level of overall clearance, compared to Harehills. Together these provided more easily managed

areas of land and therefore more uncontroversial land use decisions, without the land 'shortage' evident in Harehills. Furthermore there was not even the limited retail pressure in the district which marked Harehills for a while, and no new local communities, like the Muslims in Harehills, were pressing for sites or buildings. Instead, declining Christian churches were seeking to dispose of excess facilities.

Partly reflecting all the above factors, the pressure for local control of change from within the area was fairly limited at most times. The main pressure emerging, other than on the road scheme, sought primarily just to speed the process already decided. The desire to see the community rebuilt as soon as possible made housing allocations uncontroversial.

### Processes

On these issues - the bulk of change in the area - the process was essentially one of implementation by council officials, with limited involvement by planners other than to provide briefs for the main housing sites. Perhaps not surprisingly, public involvement in these detailed processes of management was relatively limited.

### Outcomes

It is only possible to judge the results of the treatment of the district in the broadest terms. The impression from local councillors, residents and community workers is that the outcomes were acceptable, eventually, the problem being the management of the process, especially in the 1970s. This might be confirmed by the clustering of discontent around the Liberal successes of 1978 and 1982. After these years Labour began to regain control of the ward, winning seats back in 1986, by which time the worst of the process was over. It may be justifiable to say then that the local planning represented in the Development Plan Revision, with the limited modifications made in the late 1970s, was in itself, broadly beneficial to local interests.



## Factors

The discussion above of the reasons for the variations of the Plan (mainly central policy changes) and for the durability of Plan allocations presented the factors at work in the 'non-local planning' and 'local non-planning' entailed in most of Richmond Hill during most of the study period. The dominance of the roles of council officials in the main programming departments reflected the nature of the municipal redevelopment process, as well as the absence of private investment pressure, the relative weakness of local interests and the only sporadic bursts of local political life around the periods of Liberal success. All of these factors contributed to a relatively stable continuity in local planning proposals, intent essentially on completing that part of the redevelopment cycle which had been irrevocably committed by the early 1970s. Local planning responded to the specific, substantive circumstances in which it had to operate, as much as to a city-wide approach which was only an average or a broad set of aspirations.

### **E Local Planning in Richmond Hill and Harehills Compared**

It is now possible to sum up the key differences in local planning between the two areas and attribute these differences to particular factors. First the conclusions of the summary on Harehills are recalled:

- (a) that the city-wide local planning approaches did set the broad patterns in Harehills, but were subject to significant local variation;
- (b) that area frameworks had a significant role in the 'core years' 1978-82, but by no means on all issues;
- (c) that public involvement, though sometimes important, was limited due to uneven local pressure and unfavourable structuring of some issues;
- (d) that processes and outcomes were only directly related if sets of contextual circumstances combined to make this possible.

In Richmond Hill one may summarise on these points as follows: the city-wide approach was less evidently of importance in the periods after 1974, area frameworks and public involvement were also less significant and there was often only the loosest link between processes and outcomes, given the operation of local and non-local contingencies. Expanding on the last point, the planning process, dominated by professionals, and by city-wide policies, most decided before the late 1970s, did not connect directly to outcomes; too many other factors intervened, both generally (eg by programme levels) and locally (eg by local political and community pressures). These summary points can now be filled out by comparing the two areas' experiences directly. Perhaps the most general statement that can be made connects to the different position in the 'redevelopment cycle'. A large part of Richmond Hill's planning belonged to an earlier era. This was reflected in a different planning process and different outcomes, with the era in a sense carrying forward its weight right through the period. Local planning in the area was therefore partly immune from the somewhat more open and localised form characteristic of Harehills, particularly in 1978-81.

Thus in terms of process the dominance of officials, though a tendency of much planning activity in Leeds as a whole throughout, was more marked in Richmond Hill. The Cross Green Route case stands out as a partial contrast to most other episodes or issues in the district. Equally the outcomes, except in this last case, appear essentially as products delivered by general programmes, albeit with finer local tuning from the later 1970s, rather than gains registered either by direct local pressure or by 'area politicking' by local councillors - that is, the fight for resources by ward or sector, controlled by a council leadership group. One may see Richmond Hill as classic territory for control by planners (and other officials), in the absence or weakness of other interests, local or non-local.

There is a risk of overdrawing this contrast. Just as it was evident that much in Harehills remained in the control of council officials, via 'normal' channels, in Richmond Hill the pressures applied by a few local residents were significant in the Cross Green Route case, whilst the Liberal challenge also secured political and officer attention for several years. But at the general level the Harehills local

planning exercises of 1978-81 were both of more significance and subject to somewhat more local control than the equivalent reviews in Richmond Hill.

Some of the factors behind this difference should by now be evident. Socially Harehills was more subject to the waves of change touching several inner areas of Leeds, particularly in terms of Muslim groups and a limited but significant presence of students and a few younger middle class families. Its position next to the even more 'volatile' Chapeltown meant that, especially after the 1981 riots, it benefited from the attention given by the council leader, via the Chapeltown and Harehills Liaison Committee. Richmond Hill's relative ethnic homogeneity (the Irish community's role, especially through the Catholic Church, weakening by this period) led to an absence of new energies from this direction. As in Harehills many of those involved locally were women, including the Liberal councillor elected in 1978, the leading newcomer in the Cross Green Route struggle after 1979, the community worker appointed in 1980 and, according to the latter (L 110) most of those involved in community action or care in the early 1980s. In addition the more active local Labour Councillor was a woman, not coincidentally promoting local nursery provision. As in Harehills this gendering, combined with local class/income characteristics, probably led to a weakness in the face of the dominant interests in the local authorities, with limited male involvement in most community activity.

Perhaps because of these social factors, Harehills gained from a more active local councillor presence from 1980 on. Richmond Hill had to rely on the indirect Liberal threat (only in 1979-80 did they have more direct influence via arrangements with the minority Conservative administration). Richmond Hill councillors were not part of or near to the leadership group. To a certain degree then Harehills was from the late 1970s participating in the 'new' politics of community, race and - in a dilute form - gender; Richmond Hill only imported some limited change via appointed community workers and sometimes via the Christian churches in a form which clashed with some local forces (eg Local Labour Councillors - L 109, L 110) and did not become effectively implanted.

The main core issues to which these social and political relations addressed themselves were different in Richmond Hill in some respects. The much greater

housing clearance both raised the local rehousing issue to the top of most agendas and also provided land for most required uses, in an area where there were less demands from competing private or community investors. Lack of open space was not an issue. Nor was retailing pressure, nor the future of industrial premises (those bordering the area had no problematic externalities or competing users). The key issue that was different, the major road line, structured the pace and character of local planning differently from Harehills. In Harehills the main road scheme had been dropped by the city council just before reorganisation, and the main transport issue, a lorry ban on Roundhay Road, whilst showing some of the same difficult, long term but publicly controllable structuring as the Cross Green Route, was contested in a very different manner and affected the rest of the area little.

This combination of different issues, arising from varying inheritances, public programmes and private investment pressures, with the different ways in which provision was structured for these issues, set a different dynamic in the two areas. The local planning approaches prominent in each period had to adapt to these dynamics; so apparently similar 'area frameworks' in 1978-81 had quite different contents and linked in different ways to the course of planning in each area. The only constant was perhaps the impossibility, for either of these local frameworks, to freeze planning process. So in Richmond Hill neither the Cross Green route nor the details of the local centre were resolved within the Appraisal. In Harehills even the 1981 revised planning exercise could not regulate the Rank Optics case or the use of some of the south Harehills sites. In neither area was the proposed East Leeds Local Plan, to an outside observer perhaps of some interest in Leeds's rare metropolitan push for statutory coverage, of any significance in the 1980s.

It should be noted that the majority of these distinctions apply to the years after 1974. In the redevelopment era local planning was essentially a centralised art which left less scope for the contingencies of local circumstances. Thus the overall approach to local planning in Leeds before 1974 really was that applied in Harehills and Richmond Hill. It is true that each area experienced the start of several 'interim' planning exercises from the late 1960s onwards; these have not been examined, except to a degree the Interim District Plan/Appraisal in each area of 1972-74. But these exercises all appear to be primarily detailing of redevelopment

plans. After 1974 the areas' histories diverged and with them the local planning experiences took partially different routes. The presence of the same city council over both is noticeable - the same officials with influence, the same increasing politicisation, the same evolving and problematic public programmes; so are the generally weak private economic forces in each case. But detailed differences emerged on all the factors analysed here and combined to give some degree of local planning variation.

Putting this explanation in a more general form one may say that the variation in the factors had two sources. One was the 'contingent' variation of general mechanisms within city-wide policies or city region private investment patterns; one of those policies (in a sense a very minor one, except from the viewpoint of this study) was the city-wide approach to local planning.

The other source was the 'causal' variation produced from within the district. In Richmond Hill one may say that the first source was much stronger than the second most of the time, whilst in Harehills there was on occasions more of an equal balance. The city-wide local planning approach did something to support local interests in each area and so could tip the balance slightly. But it could only have a limited effect, given the great range of other factors, very local and not at all local, that were in play.

Figure 11      **SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS • 1981 CENSUS  
(EDs IN STUDY AREAS: ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES  
EXCEPT THE POPULATION TOTALS, HOUSEHOLD TOTALS AND  
NUMBER OF WORKING MARRIED WOMEN)**

	HAREHILLS	RICHMOND HILL
Population Total	8907	10297
0-4 years	8.7	6.6
5-15 years	15.3	14.6
16-24 years	16.9	16.6
25-34 years	14.4	13.6
35-44 years	9.1	9.6
45-Pensioners	18.8	21.0
Pensioners	16.7	18.0
1 year migrants	14.4	9.4
Total households	3547	4075
Mrd cple + cdn	15.8	17.9
Mrd cple no cdn	20.1	24.0
Lone pensioner	17.3	18.5
Other lone adults	12.0	8.1
Lone parents	3.7	3.3
Other h/h types	29.8	29.8
Hseholds, 3+ cdn	8.3	5.4
Lone pensioners, 75+	7.6	8.3
No car hseholds	69.4	68.5
Nos in UK born headed hseholds	69.2	94.2
Nos in IR born headed hseholds	6.1	2.8
Nos in NCP born headed hseholds	21.7	2.2
Born UK	79.5	96.3
Born IR	3.9	1.6
Born NCP	14.1	1.3

Male unemployed	25.1	18.2
Female unemployed	13.7	9.7
Youth unemployed	31.1	22.7
Wkg mrd women with cnd 0-4	10.5	11.8
<hr/>		
Owner occupied	51.4	44.7
Council rented	16.7	37.8
Hsg assoc/empl.	6.9	2.9
Private (unfurn)	17.5	12.9
Private (furn)	7.4	1.7
<hr/>		

Source 1981 Census

Figure 12

LOCAL PLANNING PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES IN SELECTED EPISODES IN HAREHILLS AND RICHMOND HILL

Episodes	Local Planning Processes	Local Planning Outcomes
<u>Harehills</u>		
Bansteads - Park	Area of clearance decided by discussion between officials. Land use decision moved from closed inter-departmental 'technical' forums (1978-79) to open public discussion with local politicians and residents' organisation (1980-81).	General form and extent of park met wishes of majority in area, and the success of local pressure boosted local self confidence. But detailed implementation not locally controlled, and seen by some residents as less satisfactory, and with opposite effect on confidence.
Other Residential Clearance Areas (on southern boundary of area)	Mainly decided by officials in Planning and Housing Departments though influenced by local pressures on hospital parking and commitment to relocate club, backed politically.	Reflected considerable control by officials and to lesser extent by local councillors, in deciding housing scheme for elderly and large Asian families and the industrial allocations; subsequent change of latter also mainly within network of planning officials and local councillors.
Rank Optics	Final uses decided primarily by centralised political mechanisms, with only limited input from central officials, and minor influence, mainly via ward councillors, of local interests.	Results met needs of important sections of local interests - families with children and Muslim groups especially. Form of decision making likely to have discouraged local involvement and self-confidence via lengthy and uncertain process.
Ashton Road Site	GIA decision making process gave influence to residents' wishes, but partly offset by departmental pressure for industrial units and views of local councillors.	Result was a compromise between more localised and more centralised demands, meeting distinct interests in mutually acceptable form.
'Dodge City' Site	Initial decision mainly set by owners/developers and development control officials, later opened up by resident pressure, so that joint action by officials and councillors.	First outcome reflected low key consideration of use by officials, later response influenced by opening up of process although only produced non-deterioration of situation, not amelioration - pressure not continuing and strong enough to produce more for those in immediate vicinity.
Trinity Methodist Church	'Normal' decision making by owner, development control and public housing investment process, with no controversial element.	Beneficial to local elderly and to Methodist Church, reflecting owner's goals and understanding of local housing needs, backed by public officials.



St Augustine's site	Mixed 'normal' departmental decision making (for housing) and localised political involvement for Muslim use, independently of local planning framework.	Result reflected pressure of departmental influence probably more than balance of local wishes, though mixed interests in area.
<b><u>Richmond Hill</u></b>		
Cross Green route	Primarily non-local decision making at all stages, but with some influence by local groups in 1979-81 and to lesser extent later, after likely route outside district. City council officials and councillors playing some part after 1979 in shifting route southwards.	Up to 1981 outcome prejudicial to local residents, after 1981 more advantageous, though likely secondary effects on local network still remaining.
Local centre	Largely decision making by council officials and to some extent local councillors; very occasional push from local residents.	Except for non-implementation of shops proposal and (from some viewpoints) decision on Homeless Persons Unit, much of centre implemented by 1986 to advantage of significant range of local interests - responding to electoral pressure and overall perceptions of officials and councillors.
Housing, Open Space and School allocations	Dependent on centralised programming within overall council policies, with officials most involved in decisions; though residents with occasional influence in clearance process.	Results extremely slow, although finally benefitting local residents to significant extent, via local rehousing and provision of new schools and open spaces.

Figure 13

INFLUENCE OF SELECTED FACTORS ON PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES OF LOCAL PLANNING IN PARTICULAR EPISODES IN HAREHILLS AND RICHMOND HILL

Episodes	Citywide Planning Approach	Local Public Programmes	Private Investment Levels	Role of Professionals/ Officials	Role of Councilors	Local Physical/ Spatial Relations	Local Social Relations
The Bantseads	General openness and support for area frameworks in 1979-81 furthered greater responsiveness at that stage.	Relative ease of access to open space funds helped towards land use decision.	Only implicated in that no private sector pressure to use land.	Much more influential in clearance and implementation phases than in land use decision, especially in later stages.	Local councilors very influential in supporting land use decision.	Clearance decision confused by uneven quality of houses. Spatial location and extent of site affected land use decision via externality effects of road and adjoining houses.	Linking of 'outsiders' living in area with organised local interests helped to overcome generally weak organisation and divided communities.
Other Residential Clearance Areas	Support for area frameworks encouraged consideration within 1979-81 reports, but later politicised networking forms favoured looser ad hoc approach.	Feasibility of implementation of housing, club and hospital parking proposals favoured these uses.	Little industrial interest in proposed allocations.	Important role at most stages of allocations, primarily by planners.	Local councilors only sporadically involved.	Positions and shapes of sites restricted options significantly and encouraged the resulling allocations.	Limited local resident organisation restricted public involvement and influence, except in hospital parking complaints.
Rank Opics	Politicised networking accentuated as issue progressed by salience of area for council leadership, reducing degree of public involvement.	That funds made available for school and centre at key moment essential to allocation - schools and inner area programmes controlled by council leadership.	Absence of private interest except for retail use permitted public acquisition, although after long period of uncertainty.	Officials had decreasingly significant position as issue controlled by councilors.	Controlled by, above all, council leadership, though local councilors also involved.	Large size of site permitted range of possible uses, and in the end allowed two developments which could not be sited elsewhere in district.	Increasing importance of Muslim communities, in organisations and in party politics, helped to secure gains against other local or non-local interests without this local base.

Ashton Road site	General approach of late 1970s included public participation in GIA schemes; worked out in that framework rather than via 1979-81 area reports. But general openness helped some responsiveness to local wishes.	GIA scheme/LAP funding supported both elements of scheme.	Dereliction of factory via lack of private interest opened route to council acquisition.	Officials had important role in splitting of site and progressing of schemes, including role of valuers/Estates officials.	Most active councillor influenced industrial allocation.	Location and size of site restricted possibilities and doubtless limited competition from other uses.	Local resident pressure supported play area allocation, but only organised to limited extent; permitted compromise of splitting site.
'Dodge City' site	Absence of any area framework reduced chances of public discussion and influence.	No programmes directed at this issue in this area - so intervention less likely.	Dynamics of retail investment dominated issue, in both phases.	Influential in both phases, first in granting permission, then in resisting change of use.	Significant channel of complaint in second phase, via local councillors.	Location of site helped to create potential for disturbance to adjoining residents, given large scale user.	Local organisation limited, helping to permit first application and restrict extent of control later - though some success achieved.
Trinity Methodist Church	Uncontroversial nature of proposal meant that little local planning involved of any kind.	Housing funding permitted residential element.	Low market demand meant 'social' use most appropriate given that site had low development value.	Mainly decided by housing and planning officials.	No controversial element, so no involvement.	Location meant use not likely to be problematic.	Role of Methodist Church and nature of proposals and of local interests meant that uncontroversial proposal.
St Augustine's RC School site	Existence of GIA scheme and 1979-81 frameworks meant potential for open discussion in relation to other sites and issues.	Availability of housing finance (and absence of funds for religious groups in this case) facilitated eventual decision.	Absence of private investment interest reduced site value and made council purchase easier.	Outcome probably reflected officials' preference, in Housing and Planning departments.	Significant role in opposing and then facilitating possibility of Asian group use - both local and leading councillors involved.	Site's position meant potential for objections to any possibly intrusive use from surrounding residents.	At first local organisation worked against Asian use, but increasing salience of Muslim groups - though not wealth to develop - pushed political intervention.

Cross Green route	Only helped to limited extent given intractable nature of issue and limited local organisation - though provided some <u>possibility</u> of local framework and involvement.	Long term nature of proposal, due to cuts in funds, partly responsible for very slow progress of decision making - but also giving therefore time for change in attitudes on road building.	Not relevant, except probably reducing costs of land acquisition of most possible routes, due to lack of market demand.	Very central role of engineers, in technical decision making form, though with planners also able to argue from land use viewpoint.	Local councillors not very influential: council leadership later having some role in pushing route south.	Very important in setting the range of externality effects to which both officials and residents responded.	Relatively weak organisation meant that very dependent on a few individuals, so pressure sporadic and not very strong.
Local Centre	Issue little opened up to public discussion, so general approach little effect in this case.	Very important in setting rhythm of implementation of public sector proposals, most completed over 10 year period by 1986.	Significant in that no private interest in retail development; only pubs, clubs and churches remained.	Officials, especially planners and Estates officers, responsible to extent for slow progress of private sector side, but planners central in retaining and promoting centre as a whole, with 'social' professions.	Some role in obtaining local facilities eg day nursery.	Given position set early on redevelopment framework, externalities largely 'planned out'.	Weakness, partly created by long drawn out clearance rebuilding process, limited local involvement and pressure for new facilities.
Housing, open space and school allocations	Limited control ceded on this issues in most cases - primarily not put within control of area frameworks - adherence to Development Plan.	Primarily dependent on flux of housebuilding programme, allowing local rehousing.	Limited interest, leaving public programmes dominant.	Dominant in programming decisions, mainly in Housing, and Education Departments.	Limited role, able to raise problems with implementation or phasing.	Mainly of limited significance, given broad decisions on clearance and on retention at relatively early stages.	Relative weakness of local organisation restricted control, though Liberals pressure partly rested on local discontent.

## **CHAPTER 6    LOCAL PLANNING IN TWO MANCHESTER NEIGHBOURHOODS**

### **A      Introduction**

### **B      Profiles of Gorton North and Moss Side**

### **C      Planning Episodes in Gorton North**

1.    Gorton District Centre (Shops)
2.    Hyde Road Scheme
3.    Hyde Road Sites
4.    Gore Brook Valley
5.    Infill sites within core of district
6.    Analysis and summary of Gorton North cases

### **D      Planning Episodes in Moss Side**

1.    Moss Side Shopping Precinct
2.    Princess Road Scheme
3.    Quinney Crescent Exercise
4.    Walmer Street Allocations
5.    Royal Brewery Expansion
6.    Infill sites within core of district
7.    Analysis and summary of Moss Side cases

### **E      Conclusions**

1.    The Effects of Neighbourhood Differences
2.    The Effects of City Differences

## CHAPTER 6 LOCAL PLANNING IN TWO MANCHESTER NEIGHBOURHOODS

### A Introduction

The purpose of the examination of local planning in two areas of Manchester is to understand the effect of the different city context - how this 'adds on' to the very local differences in the area situations. In Chapter 4 these city level differences were considered. The partial variation in local planning approaches was described, and explained by reference to the differences in city politics, in the operation of public programmes and in professional preferences of key officials. Here therefore, in order to grasp the difference in city context, one needs to take account of both this difference in local planning approach and the city-wide factors themselves, which helped to create contingent variation in each area.

The process of selecting areas in Manchester was described in Chapter 1. Within the two areas a number of episodes or issues were chosen for detailed examination, as in Leeds, based on their significance within the area and their tendency to reveal important aspects of the process of local planning. The bulk of the chapter will examine these episodes, using the same format as in the last chapter. A concluding section will consider the forms of variation between the areas and the two cities. First of all the areas will be introduced. Their location is shown on Map 14.

### B Profiles of Gorton North and Moss Side

First a summary of the physical change in each area will be presented. Then the social character, party and community political activity and local processes will be compared.

#### 1. Physical Change - Gorton North

The study area is only a relatively small part of the district of Gorton, which is divided for council electoral purposes into Gorton North and Gorton South. Within Gorton North the main concentration has been on the eastern end of the ward, excluding any detailed consideration of either the almost completely redeveloped western section or the small part of the ward south of Hyde Road. (The main

sources in this summary are key documents M 66, M 76, interviews M 91, M 93 and local observation in 1986-7).

The population of the study area was just over 9,000 in 1981. The area is shown on Maps 15 and 16, the first being from the 1969 Plan for Gorton and West Gorton, the second from the 1982 Area Information booklet, showing some housing changes. The major redevelopment drive began in the area in the 1960s, moving eastward from West Gorton (partly in the adjoining ward) and coming to a stop in the early 1970s at about Wellington Street, although with a number of smaller outliers of clearance further east. This mirrored fairly accurately the original building of the district, which had moved outwards in the same way, marked especially by the introduction of higher by-law standards in 1901; much of the remaining older housing is from after that date. The redevelopment of residential areas was mainly completed by the late 1970s, the later phase being the estate between Garratt Way and Gorton Lane. Other redevelopment followed more slowly, with new schools provided in the 1960s and early 1970s, but new shops not appearing until 1980-82 and other community facilities, such as open spaces, library, swimming pool only just emerging by 1986. One of the major investment schemes affecting the area, and particularly the area allocated for shops and community facilities, was the widening scheme for the main radial route of Hyde Road. This was still not definitely programmed in 1986. Another main proposed through route, a north-south connecting link through the eastern part of the area, was abandoned in the mid 1970s.

Very much overlapping with the redevelopment programme was the refurbishment initiative starting around 1975. This made some progress, with large parts of the area included in HAAs and GIAs and fair levels of improvement except for in the private rented sector. Environmental improvement gradually progressed as well and some smaller housing infill schemes were completed by the council. The scheme for the Gore Brook Valley Park moved very slowly, but parts were completed by 1986. There was limited investment in new facilities; mainly these were supposed to be located in the border area around Garratt Way at the boundary of the older and newer houses.

Social change was not very extensive in the last two decades, with a fairly stable working class population, with little black settlement. Both the estates and the older areas remained relatively popular areas to live. In this sense then the physical changes in the area, though extensive, did not alter the social character by 1986 to a great degree.

## 2. Physical Change - Moss Side

The study area selected does not cover all of the district traditionally known as Moss Side, nor is it exactly limited to it. There is little treatment of the Alexandra Estate west of Princess Road which was built in the mid 1970s on the old western half of Moss Side; though it has been important for the general 'tone' of the district that this estate, whilst designed to be the first of the good quality, low rise estates after the retreat from tower blocks, has in fact had great problems of design and management. To give a rounded picture it has been necessary to deal with a few of the issues on the west side of Princess Road, especially the shopping precinct. The main emphasis however is on the large band of turn of the century housing stretching east as far as Wilmslow Road, into Rusholme, between the northern and southern boundaries of Moss Lane East and Platt Lane. The sources in this section are mainly Wheale (1974, 1979), Nicholson (1974) and key interviews (particularly with planners, M 135 and M 134) and documents (especially M 98 and M 104), with observation of the area's physical environment in 1986-87.

This is a larger study area than Gorton North, with a population of about 14,000 in 1981. This greater size reflects the greater difficulty of separation from the areas adjoining. This sector of Manchester was especially subject to the massive push of the late 1960s and most of the 1970s in the redevelopment programme. As a result most of the goals, in physical terms, were achieved, with not only the Alexandra Estate but also smaller schemes in the centre of the area around Upper Lloyd Street and in Rusholme around Walmer Street. Similar progress was made in terms of schools (though mainly just north of the study area), shops (the shopping precinct) and some community facilities - health centres and a sports centre in the District Centre. Some of these features can be seen on the two maps (Maps 17 and 18), from the 1971 Plan and the 1982 Area Information booklet. This progress proved to be less impressive in retrospect, with the growing problems



of the Alexandra Estate and the shopping precinct - bought by the council in 1978 due to its lack of profitability. All of the 1960s road schemes in or near the area were abandoned except for the one for Princess Road; this was implemented in a much reduced version in 1984.

The improvement initiative of the mid 1970s did not achieve so much, again at least in physical terms. House refurbishment progressed relatively slowly throughout the private sector, which remained dominant in the older housing areas. There were in the 1980s several infill housing schemes, especially by housing associations, and slowly environmental improvements began to appear. There have been an increasing number of smaller community projects, again especially from the early 1980s. But several schemes for open space and community buildings remained to be carried out by 1986. A programme of support for refurbishing older shop premises began in 1984 but was also making very slow progress.

Social change reflected - and, as will be discussed, partly caused - this record, with the character of the area enduring behind the shifts in housing tenure and the physical improvements in many respects. Moss Side remained a predominantly poorer working class area, with ethnically mixed population.

### 3. Area Comparisons

#### Social Character

Moss Side has remained 'transitional', a more diverse area, with more mobile population, compared with Gorton North - Figure 14 shows some of these contrasts. (The sources here are the same as in the last two sections). It has had a somewhat incoherent spatial identity, part redeveloped into the newly named Alexandra Park, battered at its other edges by more redevelopment. In terms of incomes and household forms it was often high on the normal deprivation indices, with many unemployed people, many elderly, many one parent families. In some ways its historical reputation compounded this, but at the same time this created some bonds of 'place identity', based on the very considerable depth of layering of in-migrants, - long established Afro-Caribbean and Irish 'communities' in particular. Internally generated community action was often supported by the interest and involvement

stemming from the adjoining middle class or university areas of inner south Manchester.

Gorton North was more homogeneous, composed of less mobile and less deprived households, with a high proportion of skilled manual male workers or ex-workers and only a small number of black settlers. Spatially and socially it was quite secluded, somewhat cut off by railway lines, roads, canals and open space, not close to middle class areas. Overall then there was a somewhat lesser plurality of interests 'available' for expression.

Moss Side has had strong roots of activity from within the area from at least the late 1960s, although this always interacted with outsiders. The tradition of community action remained strong, more influential locally than party politics, which depended normally on small numbers of active people - in the case of the Labour Party often students or ex-students. The Labour Party had the main significance electorally from the early 1970s, and the ward moved gradually to the left, eventually gaining from the citywide shift, in that in 1984-86 two local councillors held key chairs, of the Housing and Planning Committees.

Parry, Moyser and Wagstaffe (1987) suggest that in Moss Side "political deprivation was added to economic deprivation" (p 249), mainly due to a disjunction between the community activists and the political parties. This they feel was due in large part to the dislocation of community which redevelopment caused, disrupting political linkages. They suggest that this political failure was a major factor in preparing the ground for the 1981 riots (their prime focus of interest).

Community politics did threaten to erupt into the electoral arena directly in the early 1970s, with neighbourhood groups getting large votes in local elections. Community action was much involved in urban renewal issues both in redevelopment (against the Moss Side West clearance ) and in rehabilitation, in the several HAAs and GIAs since 1973. In the shape of the 1981 riots it also challenged all legitimate political forms and drew further attention to the area's needs, focusing some degree of urban renewal emphasis in the years after 1981.

The extent of Moss Side's activity must not be overemphasised - on most issues and on most occasions non-involvement, on urban renewal as other issues, was the norm. Nevertheless the people in the area did manage, in one way or another (whether through Labour politicians, outsider led voluntary bodies or the riot stimulated Task Force or other economic initiatives) to secure a significant degree of responsiveness and resources for their area and some of their needs. In this sense one might argue that Parry, Moyser and Wagstaffe's picture of political failure is overdrawn, though the non-articulation of political interests to which they draw attention has been real enough.

Gorton North also had some successes in this respect, but in a much more controlled manner, essentially through Labour Party managed 'self-government'. There was quite an active spread of club or church activity in the area, and a number of residents organisations connecting to redevelopment or rehabilitation. But in general these tended to tie in to or be subordinate to the Labour Party. The local Labour Party was securely founded on the Labour and Trades Club which had a large membership based on the skilled manual tradition of the area. This meant a continuing Labour-carried 'municipalist' local hegemony of a 'moderate' or traditional form. Community organisations made little impact in such a situation, normally controlled by Labour councillors or members and dealing with relatively marginal issues. The traditional views of many residents both kept Labour councillors to the right and gave a continuing base for Conservative and Liberal politicians, who often had significant votes (though only once being elected, a Conservative to the county council in the late 1970s). At any rate one sees here a very different form of politics from the continuing if unpredictable liveliness of Moss Side.

### Local Processes

Many of the public processes affecting both areas were not local. Much of what influenced area renewal stemmed from predominantly centralised forms such as the Development Plan, the local plans of 1969-71 and the central procedures such as the officials working groups (eg the Sites Appraisal Group) or the councillor - official working parties of the mid 1980s. In the same category would come, normally, those processes which had some local facet but in most situations were

still primarily tied to central administrative systems, such as ward information leaflets, the local offices of some departments or the area-defined central officials. On occasions, such as in the renewal offices of the Housing Department in the late 1970s, or where planners covering particular areas acted with special enthusiasm or persistence, these could take on some local force, if officials tried to support 'their' areas, but this appears to have happened only to a quite limited extent.

The rather more genuinely local processes included a number of consultative bodies and various ad hoc consultative exercises. They were much more evident in Moss Side, due primarily to its history of community politics and to the shock effect of the 1981 riots. Thus both areas had consultative bodies set up as part of the Inner City Partnership initiative in 1978-80, called Inner City Ward Committees. But only in Moss Side did the committee have significant life and survive on into the late 1980s. Particularly after 1984 it was involved in urban renewal matters, supported at certain times by the Community Technical Aid Centre (CTAC, a city-wide part council funded agency). Its meetings were rarely attended by many local residents, but it did make serious efforts to consult locally.

In addition in Moss Side there were two other Consultative Committees. One was set up in 1978 when the council bought the Moss Side District Centre. Its role gradually widened, having a significant decision making position on planning applications in the district and having much other council business affecting the area referred to it for comment. It met on the 5 weekly committee cycle, like any main council committee. The other local body was the Maine Road Consultative Committee, set up to deal with problems from the location of Manchester City Football Club in the middle of older residential Moss Side. It proved a useful channel for discussion, meeting occasionally, as required. Moss Side also had more than its fair share of ad hoc consultative exercises on urban renewal issues. A few exercises were organised in Gorton North but they tended also to be on a smaller scale.

One can see therefore that urban renewal has been affected by a considerable range of forms, from the thoroughly unorganised riots to the most 'constitutional' or electoral or bureaucratic controls. The changing consultative landscape opened up opportunities in both areas, but given their different characters and variable party

politics, this resulted in quite different local influences on renewal and planning. So it would appear that the presence of the more local forms in Moss Side did tend to help those in the area but this still depended on the detailed operation of the forms, their powers and the potential ability of local actors to take advantage of the forms provided. It would appear too that city-wide factors, especially the control by the Labour Party machine and the spatial peculiarities of the 'voluntary sector', have nevertheless limited the extent of variation that might have been expected from such different characters. So 'place force' could certainly not be 'read off' in any simple way from 'place character', in these areas.

## **C      Planning Episodes in Gorton North**

In recounting and analysing local planning episodes there is a certain parallel between the two areas. The majority of cases selected are on the edge of each area, rather than in the cores which have been primarily composed of declared HAAs or GIAs. The land use changes in the latter sections are considered briefly in contrast to the more major changes which have taken place on the borders. This difference between the cores and the edges is of significance, in that it reflects the differing historical-spatial configurations generated by the redevelopment programme and main road schemes. The historical contingencies of each place mattered. Several differences between the districts will be evident, which have been added to and have interacted with influences 'coming down' from the city level or above.

### **1.      Gorton District Centre (Shops)**

#### **Course of Events**

The 1969 Outline Planning Brief (M 66) indicated on the design strategy plan the site for a 'main shopping centre'. It argued that the existing Gortoncross Street shops were well located and that redevelopment should recreate a centre for public uses and shopping. This should involve a full range of convenience goods, requiring 30 units, and possibly an element of comparison goods, making a total of 40-60 units. It was stated that the extent to which existing shops would be cleared would have to be worked out as part of the detailed proposals. At any rate over half the shops in the plan area were expected to disappear, mainly on the radial

roads.

There is no evidence of any public consideration of this brief and thus of this issue either at this stage or through the 1970s up to 1978. The brief hoped that shopping and community facilities would be provided concurrently with residential and industrial development. Redevelopment of the section of Gorton identified in the 1969 Brief (see Map 15) proceeded during the 1970s and in fact the shops scheme was progressed at the end of the residential building process. The District Centre proposal was well known to officials - for example the Cross Lane HAA declaration report in 1976 refers to the scheme (M 88). Finally in 1978 the scheme moved forward rapidly.

In April 1978 a report to District Centres Sub-Committee put forward a draft commercial brief for a new shopping centre, to supplement the municipal market (M 68). Map 19 is copied from the brief finally issued later in the year. A 'theoretical report' in December 1976 had apparently noted that there was only limited demand for retailing, but that the scheme rested in part on social need. The 1978 report said that all the relevant officers in the city and county councils had been consulted. A 6.2 acre site was proposed, with a 30,000 sq ft supermarket and up to 20,000 sq ft in smaller units. It was felt that given the difficulty of the site and the splitting of the centre by Hyde Road (the remaining shops would be on the south side) the brief should be flexible "as a developer input was required" (M 68 p 2). The land was owned by the council.

The process from this point to the start of the arrangements to short list developers at the end of the year appears to be essentially public confirmation of the decisions taken by officials and the key councillors. The main active councillor in Gorton North was first deputy chairman (1973-77), then chairman (1977-81) of the Planning Committee and so was in a strong position to push the project (M 93).

In June 1978 the Policy Committee confirmed the scheme, noting the comments of other committees, including the South Central Area Consultative Committee. The most significant input was from the Markets Committee (M 69). There are strong signs of a forceful Markets Department, which had a significant effect on the scheme, including pressing for management of proposed small kiosks. The market

area was redeveloped in 1979-80, with a food hall adding 37 stalls to the 96 open stalls. A tight programme for implementation was set, and it was argued that there was not time to consult the Manchester Conference (this was the coordinating voluntary sector body set up to comment on issues within the inner city boundary). A public meeting was proposed for July; in fact it took place in September.

The notes of the public meeting suggest officers well briefed to argue that the proposed scheme was the best possible one; despite many critical questions, there is no evidence that the scheme was altered (M 70). The Secretary of the Gorton Village Residents Association recalled that a meeting with the Planning Department had led to a doubling of the car park to 200 spaces - as residents considered this essential to support the centre (M 94). Later it was argued by councillors that the public had influenced the design (M 96 19.2.80). But the dominant impression is of a powerful municipal mechanism which regarded public consultation as of only limited importance.

In due course House of Orange Developments were awarded the project. A Gorton District Centre Working Party of Town Clerk's, Estates and House of Orange progressed the scheme to completion in 1982. The Coop acquired the supermarket, and a shopping profile in late 1982 stated that most of the smaller units were pre-let (M 74). It was admitted though that only one of the former occupiers of Gortoncross Street had taken a new unit, despite the council's promises to give them first offers; as residents had feared, rents were doubtless too high (M 75).

The overall result was criticised by residents representatives, who argued that the old centre had been better, and that an original scheme for a larger indoor market and larger store had been unwisely dropped (M 95). The councillor centrally involved in the process considered that the best possible scheme and design had been obtained, given the low incomes in the area and competing attractions for car drivers (M 93). Visits in 1986-87 revealed a centre with evident letting and environmental problems, though with a well used supermarket.

## Processes

Both the original proposal (in 1969) and its implementation in 1978-82 were arranged primarily by officials, coordinated normally by the Town Clerks Department reporting to Policy Committee (or its Sub-Committee). This reflected the major programme of district centre schemes throughout Manchester. In Gorton the local councillors were much involved, through the chairmanship of the Planning Committee. Though public consultation occurred it seems to have been a token exercise.

## Outcomes

The replacement of the 246 shops existing in 1971 by the 70 present in 1980 was seen by residents as representing a loss. No doubt however the retention of a market and provision of a 30,000 sq ft supermarket represented significant achievements, given the decision to clear Gortoncross Street. Nevertheless the end result was a centre divided by Hyde Road and with relatively limited choice and only moderate environmental quality.

## Factors

- (a) The typical local planning approaches of the periods are evident in this case, with the 'municipal machine' controlled on a city-wide basis by leading councillors and officers.
- (b) The absence of a public programme mechanism for shop development - as against the very active sponsorship of markets provision - affected the scheme. But that there was a strong overall drive for new District Centres was essential in securing a commitment for new shops of some kind.
- (c) The limited interest in development and, especially, management of a new centre reduced the final quality of the centre. But the location near the city fringe on a main radial meant that there was some interest - a developer was found and many occupiers moved into the centre.



- (d) Professionals within council departments controlled most of the process of planning and implementation.
- (e) Local councillors, given their position in the council leadership, had some input to the project, although probably mainly following the advice of officials.
- (f) The overall location of the site, within a relatively low income district but accessible to prosperous areas, meant that it was only moderately attractive to the retail industry. Its specific spatial position adjoining an uncertainly positioned long term road widening line created problems of design and implementation which were hard to overcome.
- (g) The only moderate activity of local residents reduced their influence on the project, although through local councillors they no doubt had some effect in pushing for implementation.

Overall then these factors worked together to give an outcome which was of some local value, but which was obtained through a somewhat remote and alienated local planning process. The city-wide tendencies against forward planning and public involvement were reinforced by the local social and political relations. These meant that faith was placed in local councillors to represent local interests, with other residents only involved to a limited extent.

## 2. Hyde Road Scheme

### Course of Events

The proposal to widen the Hyde Road had already existed for many years when it was incorporated in the 1969 planning brief (M 66) as the Hyde motorway. At this stage it was to have 6 lanes and to be in part on stilts (M 93, M 95). It was proposed for construction after 1976. Another major road, the D23, also cut through the east end of Gorton, running north-south, but there were already some doubts over the need for this route in 1969. The declaration report for Cross Lane HAA in 1976 noted that the D23 had been dropped and the Hyde Motorway scheme

revised (M 88).

The scheme was generally seen as long term; at the shopping centre public meeting in 1978 the estimate was that implementation was at least 10 years away (M 70). In 1982 a report noted that the project was under review and that if it was abandoned, more land would be available (M 75). In 1983 the review resulted in the switching of part of the route to the north side, lifting the blight from the Woodlands Road area - but leaving the road line otherwise intact (M 92). By the time of the April 1986 ward leaflet the scheme was presented as relatively 'area-friendly', a surface level dual carriageway with numerous pedestrian crossing points (M 79); by this time implementation was not seen as likely for at least 3 years.

A Greater Manchester County (GMC) council leaflet of 1984 (M 16) showed that only two radial schemes had been retained in Manchester, from the dense network of proposals inherited in 1974; these were Hyde Road and Princess Road (in Moss Side). Therefore these were rather special cases. The explanation for the retention of Hyde Road would appear to involve several factors. The planning officer for the area felt that the main elements were the existence of most of the corridor at an early date, except for some pubs and a few other buildings in Gorton North, the fact that the communities had been divided and transformed by redevelopment already, and the perceived importance of the road in connecting to the M 57 and M 66, a major route to the east (M 91). Local councillors apparently first pushed for the road to be placed in a cutting and then for it to be abandoned (M 93); but they felt that local residents were less concerned about the road than they were.

Residents seem to have been divided, some seeing the scheme as valuable (M 95), others as just remote, with continual revisions over the years so that no one believed in it any more (M 94). In general it seems to have come into local consciousness more through the effects on side roads than in itself (M 96a).

One of the reasons therefore for the retention of the route seems to have been the limited local reaction. Gorton residents were by the late 1970s virtually the only ones still with properties directly blighted, so there was little scope for a coalition of groups along the route. And in fact even in Gorton the impact was confined mainly to a relatively short stretch of the route on the south side including about

50 houses, in what was after 1984 the Woodland Road HAA. The abolition of the GMC in 1986 placed control of the issue more in the hands of the Department of Transport and thus set up a different forum for resolution - but this extends beyond the study period, with the decision on whether to 'trunk' the route still pending in 1987.

### Processes

There is little evidence that the issue was ever removed significantly from the control of professionals, first within the city, then the county councils, despite occasional interventions by councillors. Public debate of the project was at most limited and sporadic.

### Outcomes

The blighting effect of the scheme in Gorton was tangible over a long period, both on a number of residential properties and indirectly on the way land adjoining the shifting corridor had to be planned. But it was not a very large direct impact; beyond the problems created for the Woodland residents the main sufferers were planners and other implementers in dealing with the very wide reservation strip and its knock-on effects. The gradual slimming down of the project was beneficial, in that, even if ever finally implemented, the impact on the district would be reduced.

### Factors

The most important reasons for the retention of the scheme were the relatively early creation of the open corridor and the limited local opposition to the scheme, along with its strategic position in the regional network. The long period of non-implementation on the other hand was based on the declining impetus in public programmes for road building and their lesser political attractiveness in the GMC. High level resource and policy decisions dominated the evolution of the issue.

### 3. Hyde Road Sites

#### Course of Events

Adjoining the District Centre shops were a number of pieces of land which from an early stage had been identified as suitable for a range of social and public facilities (see Map 20, from a 1982 committee report). The outline planning brief in 1969 only mentioned proposals for two swimming pools and a fire station but referred to a schedule prepared to show public requirements (M 66). Subsequent uses for the land were based on a similar planning approach, asking public agencies about their site needs. The developers' brief for the shopping centre refers in 1978 to proposals for a cultural centre (library), and Social Services, Probation and Education, Welfare and Careers Centres (M 71). But it was noted in April 1978 that no funds had been obtained for these schemes and it was hoped that Inner City Partnership finance would help (M 68).

In the 1980s funds were slowly secured for several schemes and sites were allocated through the 'SAG' arrangements (inter-departmental meetings allocating sites city-wide). Sometimes sites had to be reallocated when changes in funding or size appeared - the swimming baths scheme was allocated to part of the large site north of Garratt Way in May 1981 (M 87), and in June 1986 to all of the site - thus pushing out a probation office allocation for which funding was not yet available (M 87). For schemes with funding there was little problem in finding sites - for a petrol filling station in 1980, for a police section station in 1981-82; though in the latter case officers complained in the SAG allocation of December 1982 that the police authority had progressed the scheme much too far, prior to a formal allocation (M 87).

Before 1984 the arrangements prior to submission to SAG were via the Community Development Working Party, meeting every 2 months and composed of Estates, Planning, Town Clerks and Engineers Department officials (M 87). After 1984 there was a more politicised system, reducing the influence of officials of SAG (M 91), whereby Working Parties of councillors and officials decided issues on a citywide basis. Thus the Leisure Pool Working Party composed of 5 councillors and 5 officers met monthly and arranged site allocation and an extensive public

consultation exercise. This included a caravan with information (with 600 comments in favour of the scheme and 1 letter against) and a public meeting attended by 20 (M 87). Local councillors were excluded from the process (being outside the dominant Labour groups after 1984), but admitted that their ward was still gaining needed facilities (M 93).

A further public consultation process was mounted by planners later in 1986 to allocate sites for the probation office, the neighbourhood office and two commercial sites "to maximise the development opportunities in the Centre" (M 81). The main commercial allocation had been in existence for a long time, having been at one stage considered by House of Orange Developments as a Phase 2 of the shopping centre. A site had been marketed more than once, with no success (M 75). Now what happened in effect was that the Neighbourhood Services Working Party, which had already undertaken public consultations in the area, obtained this, the best site in most respects, for a neighbourhood office. The commercial and probation office elements were pushed westwards. Public response to the exercise appears to have been limited, but favoured all but the fourth allocation, of a restricted site for commercial use. Three residents objected to the loss of gardens caused by this and it was decided that the land should be allocated permanently for gardens and open space (M 81). The commercial unattractiveness of the site no doubt favoured this resolution.

### Processes

The conception and (slow) progression of the facilities developments was until 1984 primarily within officials working groups. The core shopping scheme had been secured in 1978-79 as part of the Manchester redevelopment machine, operating on a citywide basis. Given the power of local councillors there was informal consultation over important allocations with these councillors. But the main proposals arose from a process of inter-departmental bargaining, in which budgetted schemes secured the best sites, within constraints set by Planning or Estates officials - such as preserving a site nearest the shopping centre for a Phase 2 retail scheme, until 1985. After 1984 processes involving central councillors become more significant, in working parties also containing officials, and still on a citywide basis - but now set by topics (leisure pools, neighbourhood centres etc). There was

increased public consultation locally though this occurred after the main thrust of the proposals was virtually set. The exclusion of the local councillors from the decision making process gave it a different articulation with the locality, less 'organically' linked to the area but allowing a wider access, to all local residents rather than primarily to those close to the Labour Party.

### Outcomes

By 1986 a petrol filling station, a library, an old people's home and a police station had been developed on the District Centre land (in addition to the shopping centre). A neighbourhood office and the leisure pool were completed by 1989. Eventually therefore a range of facilities useful to most local residents resulted from the redevelopment of this part of Gorton.

### Factors

The forms and tempos of the development of these sites were set above all by availability of resources in public programmes, managed primarily within official dominated mechanisms, with some councillor input but little direct public involvement. From the clearance phase in the 1970s through to the rebuilding of the 1980s the whole process may be seen as an effective, if slow moving, example of welfare state planning intervention. Exactly which public or social uses resulted depended on a process within an adjustment forum of municipal and other public sector agencies, in the absence of much commercial development pressure or local public participation. But that some public uses eventually resulted depended on overall council policies, carried through by officials long accustomed to these policies. Thus the achievement was council wide policy led, but within that set of policies was progressed by project funding availability - opportunism nested within broader planning.

## 4. Gore Brook Valley

### Course of Events

The 1969 planning brief proposed a system of open spaces along the Gore Brook

Valley linking Debdale Park and Sunnybrow Park, either side of Hyde Road (M 66). This was seen in landscape and conservation terms, with reference to "fine trees" and eighteenth and nineteenth century cottages (M 66 p 20). Like many other elements in the renewal of Gorton, little happened prior to 1978, because the energies of implementing departments were directed elsewhere within the later stages of the redevelopment programme, with this scheme viewed, it would appear, as a lower priority (M 91). In September 1978 officials were discussing a scheme for the Valley and momentum began to build up, with councillors also expressing significant interest from this point onwards (M 86). In 1980 a public consultation exercise was carried out by planners, including the involvement of schools (M 86, M 96a). This was however after committees had given approval (in October 1979) for negotiations to be progressed in order to acquire the many outstanding private interests (M 86, M 78) (See Map 21).

There was little evidence of strong Residents Association or other public interest (M 94, M 95). In 1985 there was a request by Gorton Village Residents Association for the area to be declared a Conservation Area; whilst design sections in the Planning Department supported this, Local Plans officers secured its rejection, arguing that protection was already extensive (M 86). It appears that Conservation Area designation might have helped the image of the area and boosted house prices, but that the Local Plans officers were correct in their assessment that the use of Listed Buildings powers and the council's own programmes were sufficient forces to preserve and improve the area's character.

As the April 1986 ward leaflet explained, "progress has been slower than anticipated due to land ownership problems" (M 79). The 1984 progress report to Planning Committee noted that nearly all city owned land had been improved, but that continued efforts to acquire certain sites since 1979 had failed - especially a 12 acre site owned by British Rail. Problems had been experienced with some disturbing users as well, including scrapyards (M 78). In the end a compulsory purchase order for the remaining land was authorised in July 1985, by which time a scrapyard and waste transfer station were due to be moved and two firms would be allowed to remain in the Park, where jobs were seen as more important. By this stage therefore it appeared that implementation was nearing a conclusion.

### Processes

Each stage of the scheme - its conception, detailing and implementation - took place primarily within professional dominated processes, although with local councillors and to a limited extent other interests involved at certain stages. The main forums for progressing the project were the discussions between private owners and Estates and Valuation officials, and planners' arrangements of the compulsory purchase order and the MSC scheme for landscaping, rather than more open and public settings. To a large extent this reflected the issue - slightly removed from residents' central everyday interests - as well as the way provision of open space was structured - something understood as firmly within the council's responsibilities.

### Outcomes

The end result of a landscaped valley park, removing several 'low-intensity' industrial uses and allowing leisure use, was likely to be valued by many local residents, even though it may have reflected a relatively minority viewpoint within the area.

### Factors

Overall the availability of public funds and the local contingencies of the historical inheritance and current occupation of the land both in the end favoured the progressing of the project. The ability of officials to secure funds for acquisition and development of the area, especially using job creation schemes, was important in implementation, added to the design and conservation ideals of these professionals. The physical inheritance of an area on the fringes of Manchester's development guided the decision making within this framework. Implementation was also helped by the relatively weak force of the commercial owners and users, with the exception of British Rail - the presence of any large or influential firms might well have stopped the project, given that even two very small firms employing few people were to be allowed to stay. Nevertheless the range of ownerships delayed and complicated progress significantly, necessitating the use of compulsory powers.



## 5. Infill Sites Within Core of District

### Course of Events

The 1969 planning brief saw much of Gorton North as possible residential improvement areas (M 66). In due course all of the areas so marked became HAAs or GIAs, firstly Cross Lane HAA in 1976 along the border closest to redevelopment (M 88) and then Abbey Hey HAA and Longford Lane GIA in 1979-80 (M 89, M 90). However these declarations do not appear to have affected decisions on sites or land uses within the core of the district to a great extent. The local Housing Department (after 1984 Environmental Health Department) office dealt primarily with house improvement (M 92). Land uses were dealt with in ad hoc fashion by the relevant sections of Housing or Planning or Education departments, according to no particular plan or set of local guidelines, normally through the SAG procedures. (This summarises examination of Planning Department files and interviews with officers in Planning and Housing Departments, covering a number of small sites created by clearance for unfitness or acquisition for housing use; the main sources are M 82, M 83, M 86, M 91, M 92).

There is little evidence of local resident involvement in these issues, although the founding of one residents association in 1973, in Abbey Hey, did stem from a fear that a small clearance area was a beginning of more extensive redevelopment in that part of Gorton (M 89, M 94). Very little further clearance took place within the Abbey Hey and Districts Residents Association area.

### Processes

Decisions on clearance and land use in the bulk of the retained section of Gorton therefore occurred primarily within 'normal' official run channels, mainly on a city-wide basis, though from 1976 with some input from the local Housing Department office based on Hyde Road - who were in contact with local residents groups. These groups were themselves, in at least one case (Gorton Village Residents Association), stimulated by the local Community Development Officer (in the Social Services Department (M 94)).

## Outcomes

The main impression obtained within the HAA/GIAs is of very slow implementation, with no coherent local input in deciding and pursuing uses. By 1986 however several housing infill schemes had been completed and other small sites landscaped. There were therefore some gains for local residents, but at a slow pace, reflecting the relatively low priority which the areas appear to have had for funding and the absence of strong local voices, especially in the 1980s, whether inside the council structure or from within the area.

## Factors

The decisions of officials on clearance and on new land uses were based primarily on the availability of public funding for schemes, particularly given the absence of commercial development interest in the district, especially on these smaller sites. The very scattered and small scale nature of clearance encouraged an ad hoc approach to planning re-use, and a lower prioritising of such decisions and implementation. Local pressure seems to have done little to alter this pattern, except to push against further clearance.

## 6. Analysis and Summary of Gorton North Cases

### Factors

It will be helpful first to summarise the varying roles of each factor in the five issues or episodes. After that a more general picture of local planning in the district will be presented.

- (a) The city-wide local planning approach set fairly firmly the local planning forms used in Gorton North, from the 1969 brief, through to the officials and leading councillor arrangements of the 1970s and early 1980s and on to the mixture of central councillor and public consultation procedures after 1984. The relatively early and extensive commitment to clearance, combined with a local political mechanism supporting this, gave the 1969 brief a long life

in most respects, as an overall guiding framework, probably more so than elsewhere in the city. In addition the fact that local councillors were powerful in the leading group from 1973-84 changed the form of local planning slightly, in the possibility of inserting local concerns more easily into the municipal machine. To some extent the reverse occurred after 1984, given the local councillors' exclusion and thus the occlusion of the main 'consultative' mechanism up to that point - informal contacts in the Trades and Labour Club - from local planning processes. Thus there was some local variation of the dominant planning approach, but overall adherence to the 'non area framework' arrangement of local planning after the early 1970s.

- (b) Public programmes, often guided by strong city-wide policies, were centrally important in the renewal of the area, right up to 1986. Even in the shopping centre, funded privately, the commitment to a programme of District Centres and to municipal markets was essential to implementation. In all the other cases the often slow but eventually secured or programmed public funding of schemes was key to allocation and implementation.
- (c) Whilst not beyond consideration, Gorton was not an area of great attraction to private investors, given its low incomes and essentially working class image. The absence of takers for the commercial sites near the shopping centre as well as the modest scale and quality of the centre itself were testimony to this. That the centre was built at all did however reflect the fact that Gorton was not 'beyond the pale' for some investors. This would be confirmed by the fairly solid owner occupied housing market, the continued existence of many smaller shops and the investment in industrial premises, such as the factories turned into Gorton Industrial Estate and Railway Street Industrial Estate at the beginning of the 1980s (M 85a).
- (d) Professional officers in council departments were the primary agents in the planning and implementation of Gorton's renewal, although they worked within broad council-wide policies. These officers were normally based in central departments, the main exceptions being the Housing Department improvement office after 1976 and the Community Development Officer in

Social Services Department. There were very few 'local social professionals' in Gorton of the kind found in many inner city areas, in community projects etc. Centralised mechanisms such as those to allocate sites, progress district centre schemes or review road lines dominated decision making, even after 1984. In so far as the Manchester system worked to the advantage of Gorton residents, it was these central mechanisms which were primarily responsible.

- (e) Nevertheless local and leadership councillors both had inputs into the process, particularly given the important position of local councillors up to 1984. It is not easy to establish the extent of this control; the impression is that in the shopping centre it was significant, and possibly in the Gore Brook Valley, due to the leading councillor's strong interest. Given the large membership and regular use of the Trades and Labour Club this meant a degree of local responsiveness beyond any electoral mechanisms. After 1984 control of the Hyde Road sites allocation was much more with the new leadership group and their favoured projects.
- (f) The overall shape of the physical inheritance of the district, both in its pre-development shape and as directed by the main redevelopment proposals constrained to a significant degree possible outcomes. There was a relatively firm boundary where redevelopment stopped - in places it was ragged, causing uncertainty at the borders with Cross Lane HAA. There were thus relatively few redevelopment sites within the HAAs/GIAs. Early decisions set the physical impact of the Hyde Road to a significant extent, leaving somewhat difficult sites along the edge of the road line. And the Gore Brook Valley imposed its own physical difficulties and opportunities beyond the problems of the size and ownership of particular parcels of land.
- (g) The main organised force in Gorton North was the Labour Party, despite the Conservative success once at county level in 1978 and a significant Liberal presence. Residents associations, though not unimportant, were often informally linked to the Labour Party, and did not have any decisive inputs to the cases considered here. The same was true of local social relations generally, which were marked by broadly traditional forms in race and gender terms. Those women involved in residents' groups did not raise any

especially 'new' issues, apparently satisfied with the 'normal' welfare state or family shapes of provision. The limited extent of activity outside the Labour Party and to a degree churches and charitable groups perhaps reflected the culture of the traditional English manual working class which formed the majority grouping in this ward as in much of east Manchester. However a more intensive study of the membership and activities of local bodies in this period would be needed to be more certain about the precise form of Gorton North's 'social base' and its organisation.

### Local Planning

With the exception of the Hyde Road scheme and to a partial extent the shopping centre, the outcomes of the planning broadly set at the end of the 1960s were favourable to Gorton residents by the later 1980s. The long time scale reflected the dependence on declining public programmes and the non-use or non-availability of private capital in most cases. The dependence of the shops on private capital caused problems in the quality of the centre.

Thus a fairly centralised and often official dominated local planning process delivered, eventually, outcomes of value to at least a significant spread of local interests - the main negative points being the road scheme blight and the shops' quality, neither extensively controlled by the city council. Part of this success probably rested on the degree of control exercised through the well organised and locally connected Labour Party, made more responsive on sporadic occasions by some residents' organisations.

Neither the city-wide local planning approach nor the interests of local councillors favoured any formalising within area frameworks, after the overall directions had been set in 1969. This tended to mean that those locally 'in the know' were favoured, and other local interests were excluded through lack of information - though the ward information booklet of 1982 (M 76) and ward leaflet of 1986 (M 79) may have helped to reduce this problem. With partial exceptions through HAA and GIA processes and in special exercises for the shopping centre and Gore Brook Valley, there was little public involvement even on an ad hoc basis before 1984.

The 'Policies and Attitudes' document of 1983-86 in the Planning Department was for purely internal use (M 77). Even after 1984 the two main exercises appeared to follow the essential decisions, rather than precede them.

It is possible that a somewhat more open and area-oriented process, perhaps via an overall planning exercise in the late 1970s or 1980s, would have improved outcomes for some local interests. This might have led to a more adequately responsive and better designed shopping centre, to a more rapid resolution of the road scheme issue and to an allocation of sites nearby and within the improvement areas which could be seen to accord more definitely with most local wishes. But given local political circumstances both before and after 1984, and given the departmental mechanisms existing throughout the period, this was not a likely scenario, against the city-wide local planning tendencies. And without doubt any such exercise would have been unable to freeze the local planning process and so would still have been subject to constant revision. At any rate the Gorton North experience showed one possible, at least not very inadequate, way of carrying out local planning, even if it was more party and less interest group based than has been the fashion of the last two decades.

## **D Planning Episodes in Moss Side**

As the area sketch will have suggested, there were significant differences between Moss Side and Gorton North. The task now is to see how far these resulted in distinct local planning processes and outcomes, given the many factors which are involved in addition to local area variations. Five issues or episodes around the borders of the district will be examined, followed by a rapid review of sites in its core.

### **1. Moss Side Shopping Precinct**

#### **Course of Events**

As part of the redevelopment of Moss Side and Hulme a large District Centre was proposed, including a shopping precinct (see Map 17). This apparently changed its form on several occasions, at one stage due to stretch across Princess Road on a

bridge (M 139). In the 1971 redevelopment proposals it was expected to open in 1974/75, consisting of 100 shop units, as well as 50,000 sq ft of offices, a sports centre and pool and 200 car parking spaces (M 98). Certainly the 1971 plan did not invent the scheme - it was already referred to for example in 1968 as to "start soon" (M 152, 14.9.68). The centre was completed in 1974 by Ravenscroft at a cost of £4 million, but was almost immediately in difficulties (M 152, 8.12.77). Two supermarkets (Asda and Coop) soon left, whilst one (Tesco) never followed up its reservation of space (M 139). At the end of 1977 the precinct was proposed for acquisition by the council for £2.2 million, against the arguments of Conservative councillors who considered that it should be left private. Labour councillors saw purchase as the only way to avoid increasing dereliction (M 152 8.12.77). In the end the purchase price was £1.5 million, and a Neighbourhood Consultative Committee was set up with community representatives, to advise on the centre's management.

Subsequently the council put considerable efforts into reviving and supporting the centre, locating numerous council facilities there - a library, adult education centre, several council department's main offices (M 152, 23.3.79, M 104). By 1982 it was argued by planners that the shopping centre was only a local centre, serving needs in the immediate area (M 103). Competition from other centres with more recent, attractive provision and better transport links, as well as higher income residents nearby, damaged the centre. One of the Moss Side councillors up to 1982, who also chaired the Consultative Committee up to 1986, considered that the centre suffered from poor design, was too large and lost out through the lower density of the Alexandra Park redevelopment of Moss Side West (lower than planned in the 1960s) (M 139).

By 1986 the precinct contained a set of struggling shops, and many vacant units, on the ground floor, and mainly 'social sector' project offices on the upper level. It had little attraction for many shoppers, with a threatening air perceived by local residents (M 142, M 144). There is no doubt however that the council had given it generous support, with very low rent levels for the shops - even though this appears to have been forced on the Estates and Valuation Department by the high level of vacancies (M 103). Without doubt the 1981 riots helped to give the precinct greater prominence, given its location next to the centre of the disturbances

and its evident potential as a base for new projects. The role of the Consultative Committee was widened and its servicing by the Chief Executive's Department given a higher profile (M 136).

There is no doubt that Moss Side District Centre became a very special case, and was seen as such. Nowhere else was the retail industry so evidently unwilling to manage existing provision and only in Moss Side did the council feel itself under an obligation to acquire and manage a Centre itself. At the Gorton shopping centre public meeting in 1978 a resident queried why Gorton could not have a subsidised centre like Moss Side; the Estates and Valuation Officer had no coherent answer (M 70). It was simply that the Moss Side Centre was different - in terms of the period when it was developed and in its spatial and social location.

### Processes

The centre was built within the district centre formula normal to this period, that is, via official and council leadership mechanisms, and the same, if more politicised, process decided its acquisition. Only in the (not strictly land use planning) later stage of management was the process opened up, first in a low key manner and after 1981 with increasing responsiveness, to a range of the more organised local interests - principally those active in social and community projects (M 133, M 136, M 144). In the 1980s officials from several departments as well as local councillors and local residents were involved in the management of the centre, in a form somewhat different from the normal official mechanisms of lettings or repairs.

### Outcomes

As a profitable shopping centre the precinct was a failure and much of the shopping provision was by the late 1980s unattractive and of low quality - though some of this served the needs of local poor residents well enough. At any rate the shops would very likely have disappeared altogether if the council had not intervened in 1978. That some shops existed and that space was found for many social facilities and projects by 1986 could be seen as a gain for many local residents.



## Factors

The treatment of the precinct illustrates a difficult dynamic between commercial investment and then withdrawal, and public programme commitment. The centre's importance both as a capital asset and as a very visible symbol of council action in a politically explosive district meant that the key decisions were central and councillor led, not local, but in the 1980s lesser issues of management were influenced by active local interests.

## 2. Princess Road Scheme

### Course of Events

The 1971 Plan referred to the widening of Princess Road to 'urban motorway standard', programmed for 1974 (M 98). After 1974 the GMC redesigned the scheme, to go in a cutting (M 139). Its position on a partially widened route (both towards the city centre and further out) appears to have been one factor in the general acceptance of the need for widening. Residents, it was argued, had always been in favour of improvement, for greater safety from the very heavy traffic load carried through the area (M 143).

In 1978-80 there was a constant interaction between the county council, city council and local residents, with a gradual scaling down of the scheme. City councillors supported local residents in their campaign (called Princess Road Anti-Motorway campaign - PRAM, reflecting the predominance of mothers - M 152 2.7.79). Many people considered that the residents had some part in the reduced scale of the road scheme and the better pedestrian crossing facilities (M 138, M 139, M142). Two local activists felt that persuasion of the county councillor (then a Conservative) had been key (M 143, M 144). Only one planner suggested that road engineers had decided that lesser capacity was required once the Inner Ring Road proposal had been dropped. Though it was an effective campaign by local voluntary groups, shopkeepers and residents, he felt that "circumstances conspired" to give them success (M 135). Academics writing about Moss Side later in the 1980s referred to the campaign as "the outstanding example of community mobilisation in Moss Side", though qualifying it as "a partial success" (Parry, Moyser and Wagstaffe 1987

p 229). The widening took place in 1984-86.

### Processes

Whilst the original route had been decided many years earlier in centralised professional mechanisms, the efforts to reduce the scheme's scale through Moss Side took place within a politicised and public campaign, with professionals and councillors in both local authorities exposed to effective local pressure.

### Outcomes

The result was regarded by local interests as an improvement. In fact the form of widening no doubt satisfied a wide range of interests, local, political and professional.

### Factors

The full control of the issue within the local authorities, and the lobbying role undertaken early on by the city council within the two tier institutional form, coincided with the relatively high priority of the scheme within public programmes. The support of many professionals, especially planners, for a more modest scheme, and the pressure of local campaigning, both helped to secure the final form of the widening. This all happened outside of any local (or centralised) planning framework, as the normal city-wide approach to local planning would have led one to expect.

## 3. Quinney Crescent Exercise

### Course of Events

The Alexandra Park Estate is an area of low rise council housing built in the early 1970s on the site of Moss Side West. The houses nearest Princess Road, on Quinney Crescent, were built with few windows on the aspect to the proposed urban motorway, and a large area of land was reserved for the road. The subsequent scaling down of the scheme left a wide strip of land vacant. The 1971 plan had

envisaged a band of public open space between the road and Quinney Crescent, but by the early 1980s such landscaped areas were viewed less favourably by professionals in the council and by residents. The 1981 riots had witnessed this land used as a battleground, and this doubtless gave a significant push towards some positive use for the land.

One response to the riots was the convening of the Moss Side Conference in December 1981, organised through the Neighbourhood Consultative Committee (M 104). One of the three themes from this Conference was 'Planning', and a follow-up meeting on this topic was held in May 1982. Out of this meeting arose a proposal to consider the Quinney Crescent land (M 136). The first issue of 'Inner City News' in November 1982, published by the Inner City Ward Committee, contained a request by Councillor Spencer (ward councillor and chair of Planning Committee) for views on the development of the land. He stated that planners had no preconceptions about the uses - some possibilities were housing, light industry, shops, gardens and allotments (M 131).

During 1983 the exercise progressed through localised discussion meetings; the planner involved felt that it went well at this stage (M 135). Three proposals were put forward, for a community centre, shops (with flats above) and an open market. In October 1983 a further meeting was held to work up details of these proposals with the council's "technical experts" (M 105). After this the project ran out of steam, when it became evident that the council was not committed to any of the residents' proposals. According to the local planner the opposition came from a mixture of politicians' and officials' judgements (M 135). The open market idea was seen as threatening to the Precinct by the Estates and Valuation Officer, who had earlier even been opposing the 'paint-up' scheme for the remaining older shops on the east side of Princess Road (M 103). The Markets Department felt a more appropriate site was available next to the Precinct. Politicians supported this view; they also supported the officials' views that new shops would provide unwelcome competition in an 'overshopped area' (M 135). Finally it was felt that the community centre proposal should join the queue for such requests in other parts of the city - this appears to have been based on a 'backlash' against the major funding for Moss Side in these years. It also resulted from the questioning of officials in Social Service Departments as to which groups locally wished to use the

centre - apparently none were forthcoming (M 139).

In the May 1986 ward leaflet it was simply stated that after a number of public meetings, the land was being tidied up, with new footpaths and seats. Land was to be left for future development and it was noted that the Community Centre idea could be developed "if local support was forthcoming and finance was available" (M 109). The only result of the exercise was therefore, as planners noted, implementation of landscaping - the only element controlled directly, through ICP funding, by the Planning Department (M 135).

The exercise was regarded as a failure by local interests (M 139, M 142, M 143, M 144), increasing cynicism about the council's real responsiveness. The ex-councillor chairing the Consultative Committee saw it as a classic example of the problems of the split of planning and implementation (M 139).

### Processes

The open consultative process involved at least a core of active local residents in the Alexandra Park Estate, with a few planners and later some 'technical experts' in other departments. It thus reflected the opening up of Moss Side planning, which gained force from the 1981 riots and the views of the ward councillor who chaired the Planning Committee from 1981.

### Outcomes

The failure to deliver the proposals of local residents represented a failure to connect the planning exercise to wider concerns of both the district and other parts of the council machine, to which politicians and officials responded as much as or more than a very local exercise. Nevertheless the landscaping formed a useful if minimal improvement for local interests.

### Factors

Once again the exercise stood free of any area-wide framework and responded primarily to the controls exercised by officials and leading councillors. The site

itself was spatially difficult to manage, given the original redevelopment conception and any attempt to alter this. Thus local residents were up against significant obstacles which would only be overcome by much more organised pressure than was likely to be forthcoming in these circumstances. The position of planners in the council's power structure was shown in this case to be relatively weak.

#### 4. Walmer Street Allocations

##### Course of Events

On the eastern side of Moss Side, in fact within the district of Rusholme though still within the 1971 plan area, the use of a significant area of land was only decided in the 1980s (see Map 22). The 1971 Plan had indicated the area for residential use, with the Wilmslow Road side symbolically shown as part of the 'main shopping centre' of Rusholme (M 98). During the 1970s 3.8 acres of the 5.5 acres site was in fact allocated as the replacement site for a Roman Catholic primary school; by 1980 it had been decided that this was unnecessary but that 1.5 acres might still be needed for the school's playing fields. At the time of the report the City Planning Officer advised committees to allocate land for commercial or light industrial use, residential use and for a Day Nursery. These were seen as definite. The remainder of the site should be considered further for a possible community centre, school playing fields and car park (M 99).

In November 1981 six of the main council Committees considered a further report and agreed car parking, light industrial and community centre allocations, given that the school playing field requirement had disappeared (M 100). These allocations in 1980-81 were virtually all the result of departmental judgements or requests - the exception was the community centre proposal, which arose from the Rusholme and Lloyd Street Inner City Ward Committee's requests. As the 1981 report stated, "the land has been the subject of discussions between the various Chief Officers through the Sites Appraisal Group" (M 100).

In reality only the commercial allocation on Wilmslow Road was progressed, with a lease agreement to a developer, who proceeded to build a parade of shops on a small part of the site; these remained vacant in 1986 and there was no immediate

sign of further development in this allocation, though other forms of commercial scheme were being considered (M 110).

In 1984 the issue was the subject of a public consultation exercise. Apparently this was proposed by the chair of the Land and Development Committee; the City Planning Officer stated that he "had completed updating of various departmental requirements and could now carry out public consultation" (M 121) - reflecting the normal council procedure of internal discussions followed, occasionally, by public discussion. According to the local planner this involved many local people, although the end result was to confirm the allocations agreed in 1981 - rather surprisingly given the 'blank sheet of paper' form of the exercise, as suggested by the publicity material (M 106, M 135). Finally in late 1986 a report of the City Planning Officer amended the allocations (see Map 22), "to accommodate existing commitments and reflect revised City Council priorities" (M 110). These priorities emerged from the two most powerful Working Parties, on Neighbourhood Offices and Under 5s. These Groups had already in fact pre-empted decisions on the site, securing Committee approvals to use of the land. The City Planning Officer was left in his report of November 1986 to decide exact boundaries and provide reasons for the altered proposals, which inserted a neighbourhood office and a children's centre between the committed commercial and residential allocations (M 110).

It was explained in the report that "extensive public consultations were carried out on the existing land use allocations" and that the commercial and housing uses accord with views expressed then (M 110 p 6). The Neighbourhood Services Unit had carried out "comprehensive public consultations" in Rusholme and the Under 5's Working Party "intend to carry out public consultations" on the Children's Centre (M 110, p 6). "In these circumstances the City Planning Officer does not feel that a further public consultation exercise on the package as a whole would be very productive" (M 110 p 6).

### Processes

In reality the 1986 decisions showed the re-imposition of a centralised decision making style, as in the Gorton case, this time led by dominant councillors through Working Parties. Planners were subsidiary actors in this process, and local residents

were little involved in the locational decision. However even in 1984 it is not clear that a full opportunity to alter the allocations was given, so the effective switch was from official-decided to politician-decided allocations, both remaining largely at the central level.

### Outcomes

The commercial allocation decided in 1980 was not a success, at least up to 1986, and contributed nothing to the Wilmslow shopping centre. In contrast the three uses agreed in 1986 would be of local value; their implementation still however depended on council investment. As it turned out the children's centre was completed by 1989, but the neighbourhood office was not to be one of the Phase 1 schemes (5 offices including Gorton North) which were to be built before the decentralisation programme was brought to a halt - by, it seems, financial problems (M 135). On balance the allocations moved between 1981 and 1986 towards a more definite satisfaction of local needs, in contrast to the earlier light industry and car parking proposals, which would have been of more uncertain, wider benefit. The post 1984 Labour group can be seen to have been at least sensitive to local needs in a citywide policy sense (hence the neighbourhood office and children's centre programmes) even if they were not inquiring locally fully in every case.

### Factors

The dual dynamic of weak commercial pressure and varying and uncertain public programming was mediated by a changing pattern of official and councillor decision making process. In the end the decision by the central council leadership mechanisms was most likely to lead to implementation, because these mechanisms controlled the public programming as well. The earlier links through SAG and Planning Committee allocations committed finance less firmly - and also left a larger role to non-council initiative - in the industrial site, or in community groups showing pressure for the community centre. Local residents had somewhat less input in the 'new municipalism' of 1985-86 than in the more open ended stance of the early 1980s, because the new council leadership felt itself firmly committed to a range of policies and programmes contained in its 1984 manifesto. Locally it sought primarily to detail schemes rather than debate principles. The planners and

Planning Committee (and Chair) were keener on more open public consultation, and the programme organisers more concerned with rapid implementation. In the tension between the two - between two political principles held firmly within the Labour Group - a slightly schizophrenic planning process emerged. (Gyford's analysis (1985) of 'local socialism' identifies the same tension of participation versus mobilisation). The 1986 approach was more likely to lead to something useful happening, whilst that of the early 1980s (the Inner City Ward Committee and the open public consultation exercise) risked missing the council's priorities - as had happened in Quinney Crescent. The problems of designing a locally responsive decisionmaking process which 'delivered' are very apparent in this case.

## 5. Royal Brewery Expansion

### Course of Events

In the 1971 Plan the land occupied by the brewery was shown for 'service facilities'. This was the nearest that the Plan came to considering any part of the area for industry (M 98). In fact the brewery site became surrounded by residential development, a mixture of two-storey and maisonette council housing.

In the 1982 'Policies and Attitudes' document (M 104) it was reported that discussions had been continuing for several months with Scottish and Newcastle Breweries about the expansion of the Royal Brewery, to add a packaging plant to the existing brewery. It was argued that it was clear that only a significant area of expansion would be "a worthwhile proposition", and that "likely acquisition problems" south of Moss Lane East made a northern expansion onto the land occupied by council housing more attractive (M 104 p 23). An 8 acre site was required; this would mean the demolition of 16 single storey houses and 118 maisonettes in a 10 storey deck access block built in 1968-71 (M 105A). Before a planning application for the scheme was submitted in November 1983 the council was substantially committed to the scheme. It had initiated a Compulsory Purchase Order process for some parcels of land which the brewery would need, and the Department of Environment had approved an application for an Urban Development Grant, contributing to the cost of the scheme. (M 105A).



There was considerable local controversy about the scheme. A public meeting called to discuss the planning application was attended by about 60 people and passed a resolution rejecting the scheme. Immediately after this meeting the Housing Committee, after its own tenant consultation exercise, resolved to support the demolition of its properties. The unpopularity of the deck access block and the tenants' hopes of priority rehousing were evidently important factors, against local voluntary agencies' objections (M 105A). The Moss Side Consultative Committee were worried about many aspects of the proposal, but were partially swayed by the prospect of jobs for Moss Side residents. Members of the Committee felt that they had a significant role in securing the promise of 100 jobs for local residents (M 139, M142). The official in Town Clerk's closely concerned with the Committee also felt that the Council's hand had been strengthened in negotiations by the reaction of a wide range of local interests channelled by the Committee - in a way that would not have been possible otherwise (M 136).

However the inability of local residents to resist the scheme was partly based on local divisions. Moss Side Labour Party (the ward of the Planning Committee chair) was for the scheme, Hulme (in which the site was, just) against. The Planning Committee chair himself supported the scheme, but felt he had pushed strongly for the gains accruing to local workers (M 140). He regarded local feeling as weak, with perhaps one third of the opposition from students and one third from other outside groups. Local opponents were helped by the Family Advice Centre with leaflets, surveys and petitions (M 143). Objectors used the device of opposing a required road closure and securing the county council's support for a public inquiry on the closure. Even the Peak and Northern Footpath Society was drawn in on the closing of a public right of way (M 134). The campaign was effective enough to make the jobs commitment politically essential, but not strong enough to prevent the project.

After the scheme was completed the Consultative Committee was attended on occasion by company officials, reporting progress on local recruitment - apparently to the satisfaction of Committee members (M 133).

## Processes

The early stages of the proposals were conducted by leading councillors and officials. Only some way through the process was the issue forced into public debate by the opposition of a range of local and non-local residents. The mechanisms within the Labour Party, in the Consultative Committee and through the road/right of way closure were all significant in the form in which the public discussion evolved. By the time of the planning application the council was, it would appear, ready to support the scheme, and so this formal stage of the process, though openly played out, was probably not of great significance.

## Outcomes

The loss of council housing (much of it not regarded as attractive) and the increased visual presence of the brewery in the area represented detrimental results for local residents - to be balanced against the jobs obtained.

## Factors

The relatively vigorous response of local interests and the public strengths in the case - council ownership, need for planning permission, approval of road closure - strengthened the council's hand in dealing with the issue. On the other hand the (relatively unusual) desire of the company to invest in such a high-profile area as Moss Side also put very great pressure on the council to be cooperative. The spatial arrangement of the various elements made the search for a solution particularly hard, given the conflicting pressures on the council. Ultimately the absence of sufficient force from the residents in the immediate area affected may have been decisive, reflecting a limited commitment to this rented accommodation in this location.

Planning officers felt that the leading politicians had favoured the scheme from the start and were unlikely to be deflected (M 134). Their strong position outweighed that of others in the process. The peculiar nature of the proposal, to redevelop a recently redeveloped housing area, meant that ad hoc consideration of the issue was inevitable, outside of any area framework - but this certainly fitted the normal

council inclinations.

## 6. Infill Sites Within Core of District

The 1971 Plan suggested that most of Moss Side East would become improvement areas. But there would be three significant areas of housing clearance, allowing the provision of new housing, new schools (and playing fields) and the extension of the Great Western Street Recreation Ground (see Map 17). It is not proposed to examine how these land use changes were worked out in detail. Here the aim is just to identify several broad categories of land use decision and the general processes involved in these decisions. These generalisations will be based on a wide range of sources, primarily the files listed in M 112 - M 121, the interviews M 134 - M 142 and the 'Policies and Attitudes' in M 104.

Most of the redeveloped areas were decided by 1980, either as council housing sites (in the main central and eastern sections) or as school playing fields - often replacing sites identified for school replacements; the latter were funded under the Inner City Programme from 1978 onwards (M 115). The sites remaining in the early 1980s were mostly disposed of to Mosscafe Housing Association (sites in Palmes Street, Moss Lane East and Westwood Street) or went to some sort of open space or play use (M 135, M 104). The Housing Association, set up by churches in 1968, was evidently very highly respected by the council and became the prime actor, after the council, in house improvement and building in the area (M 142).

Four open space proposals were progressed in the early 1980s. The largest was the extension and improvement of the existing Recreation ground. This came to be discussed from 1982 to 1986 within the Inner City Ward Committee, which was revived with the input of the Community Technical Aid Centre. Something like an area improvement exercise was pursued in 1984-85 for the western sector (ex-HAAs), within the working group set up by the Ward Committee, involving a few residents but mainly linking local community agencies and the key council departments (M 134). This exercise was more concerned with management issues, but did organise public consultation on the proposals for the Recreation Ground (M 111, M 131, M 132).

Another play area was developed in the Great Southern Street area in 1985-86. A petition for a play area had been presented in May 1983; eventually after a public meeting, the formation of a residents committee and support of the main ward councillor, a scheme was agreed and funding obtained (M 119). In this as in most other instances within the area the councillor noted low public involvement - for example Inner City Ward Committee public meetings were normally inquorate (M 140).

A third scheme was for allotments; this was developed on a small cleared site from the enthusiasm of one active resident (and ex-councillor), with the Housing Department local team's support (M 131, M 104). A fourth scheme was developed within the same ex-HAA western zone, again partly through the local team (M 131, M 104).

This accounts for the majority of land use changes in the district, with the exception of a particularly complex site between Princess Road and Barnhill Street which was the area most affected by the 1981 riots; several shops had to be demolished and other CPO action followed to acquire houses and other premises. Despite lengthy discussions the future use of this site remained undecided in 1986, though the proposal to replace the Nile Club, a 'black' club long located on this part of Princess Road, was being considered (M 135).

### Processes

Most land uses were decided within 'normal' official channels, via SAG. In the 1980s there was some involvement of the local team of the Housing Department, but as in Gorton the brief to deal with HAAs and GIAs (covering much of the district in 1980) did not extend very coherently to deal with land use issues (M 137, M 138). More significant was the role of the Community Technical Aid Centre and the Inner City Ward Committee, linking together with the main active councillor and the ex-councillor (M 139, M 140). To an extent, at least in 1984-85, the working group, chaired by the councillor, exercised a coordinating function, bringing together the main public/social agencies and a handful of local residents. Thus some sort of local planning process beyond the ad hoc allocation of sites did emerge at this stage, and coordinated several smaller schemes as well as the Recreation Ground

proposals (M 134, M141). This is not to say that other public discussions did not take place over these years; but there was no consistent public forum for dealing with land use changes and so the majority of housing and school allocations, at least, took place within conventional official and committee channels.

### Outcomes

The absence of a continuing planning and implementing framework for the area, beyond the generalities of the 1971 plan, probably was one factor in the slow and uneven progression of proposals in the district, but it is very hard to indicate instances of this. Nearly all the larger schemes had been progressed by 1986 and had delivered rented housing, school improvements and various open spaces, all useful to local residents.

### Factors

Given the low commercial pressure in the area, the dominance of council and 'social agency' officials and of the vagaries of public programmes was not surprising. Though not inert, residents were not greatly involved in the majority of these land use issues, and required considerable support from officials, various projects and local councillors in order that their voice might be heard. Only a much more localised system of council organisation and community support might have significantly changed the quality of involvement and tempo of results.

## 7. Analysis and Summary of Moss Side Cases

As in the Gorton section, it will be useful first to summarise through presentation of the influence of each of the factors on local processes and outcomes.

- (a) In general the local planning process on each issue remained with the city-wide 'norm' for each period, with more open and consultative arrangements after 1981, and little tendency to decisions within area frameworks at any stage after 1974. However there were different emphases, with a more area-oriented tendency in part of the core in the ICWC/CTAC exercise of the mid 1980s, and the varying degrees of involvement more or less willingly

conceded or offered in the Princess Road, Quinney Crescent, Walmer Street and Royal Brewery cases. The most genuinely open-ended involvement in Moss Side was between the July 1981 Riots and the May 1984 Elections. At least if a central manifesto issue was concerned, as in the Walmer Street Neighbourhood Office and Children's Centre, after 1984 there was greater centralised political management - though with a new keenness to inform and consult over some aspects of council services.

- (b) As always the public funding of schemes was key to the decisions on land use, except in the sole case of private funding, of the brewery.
- (c) Absence of commercial pressure (except in the brewery case) permitted, in the long run, greater possibilities of public control of development - but this left a wide range of potential processes and outcomes.
- (d) In the more 'normal' allocations council officials were central in guiding the decision making (in the sites in the core, and in Walmer Street to 1984). In the more controversial cases (eg brewery, road scheme) their professional advice still mattered, but was only one contributory element to the final decisions, especially as the politicisation of issues in the district increased after the 1981 riots. Absence of locally based officials except in the Housing Department team reduced local orientation within the council. This however was partially offset by the range of 'local social agencies', particularly active in groups like the Consultative Committee and the Inner City Ward Committee.
- (e) Councillors (mainly at central level, though locally 1981-86 given that the ward councillor was committee chair) were very important in the 1980s, taking key decisions on the five major cases.
- (f) Both specific physical constraints and spatial locations limited development possibilities in the Quinney Crescent and Royal Brewery cases, where redevelopment plans were altered from the original 1960s proposals. Smaller sites in the core were often similarly constrained.

- (g) The community action tradition in Moss Side, along with the powerful effects of the 1981 riots, gave some force to local pressure, even if weakly organised. Only in the brewery and road scheme cases was significant campaigning pressure applied; the local unity in the second episode secured useful improvements, whilst divisions in the first reduced the gains obtained. Normally public involvement entailed only small numbers of residents or representatives of community agencies. The failure to 'deliver' after the Quinney Crescent and Walmer St exercises tended to discourage local participation, and make councillors and officials also wary of such exercises.

### Local Planning

In Moss Side the majority of development within the core of the area, begun under the broad guidance of the 1971 plan, was progressing to conclusions satisfactory to many local interests by the mid 1980s - new rented housing accessible to local residents, school and open space improvements, a reasonably sensitive road widening scheme. The changes were evidently slow in coming in many cases - particularly in the Walmer Street case, and at Quinney Crescent, but this reflected absence of public or private funding above all. The district suffered from the absence of a decentralised council presence, except for the housing improvement team, no doubt permitting a slower and less responsive process, particularly on the lesser issues and sites in the area. The activity of local councillors, the Neighbourhood Consultative Committee and the Inner City Ward Committee partially made up for this absence in the 1980s.

The force generated by the 1981 riots was almost certainly more important than any other factor in the 1980s in giving urgency to decisions on a range of Moss Side issues, although the purchase of the District Centre three years before indicated that the area had long been somewhat of a special case. It is not easy to demonstrate the riots' importance in each case, but it is noticeable that from late 1981 to 1984 there was a willingness to talk to local interests and a stronger push towards securing implementable schemes and managing the area's environment more sensitively (further evidence for this generalisation could be provided in other schemes that have not been detailed here, such as the 'paint up' scheme for older shops on Princess Road - M 102, M 103). The response to the riots was intended

to be comprehensive, covering many issues, few mainly related to land use planning. The treatment of all the issues after 1981 reflected this emphasis, especially of Quinney Crescent (where the dynamic was lost in interdepartmental and service city-wide discussions), the District Centre and the brewery. Broadly speaking councillors and officials were sympathetic to supporting local interests in the 1980s, but they had no coherent, general strategy for achieving this, with inadequate mechanisms for discovering just what the local interests were. Major tensions remained in the degree of local control that the council wished to or felt it could afford to concede, especially after May 1984. Thus the tendency to public consultation was always uncertain, as demonstrated clearly on the Walmer Street allocations.

Given all the circumstances involved by the 1980s - the centralised council machine, the political turbulence, the stage of renewal reached, the uneven but significant community force - it would have been very hard to invent a more coherent and responsive local planning process. In a stuttering and often unreliable manner the outcomes of planning often favoured at least to a degree local interests, in a context not at all favourable to those interests, given public and private disinvestment. The very uncertain forms evolved (through the ICWC, NCC and ad hoc exercises) perhaps represented the most possible, in the absence of more systematic community development and localised government or administration.

## **E Conclusions**

### **1. The Effects of Neighbourhood Differences**

There is no doubt that the local planning process in Gorton North differed from that in Moss Side. This difference was most evident in the post 1981 period, but studies of renewal and improvement of the 1970s (see Wheale 1974 and 1979) show that the earlier years also saw greater activity in Moss Side on urban renewal issues in general. The difference involved a greater (if uneven) willingness on the part of the council to consult on particular issues or cases, in Moss Side, through a range of more or less institutionalised procedures. But there was no attempt in the 1980s to create any sort of district or area framework(s) in either area.

Simplifying, the character of each area and its political articulation created two



models of how interests can be understood, cumulated and pressed for:

in Gorton North the incorporation in the Labour Party and thus city council machine, via local councillors, union and Trades Club mechanisms (seconded by linking into local associations), with an acceptance of such incorporation on a citywide basis on the understanding that resources would be forthcoming for the area sooner or later;

in Moss Side a much more conflictful and disintegrated range of pressures, articulated unevenly by electoral and non-electoral mechanisms (voluntary bodies, riots), which then became partially incorporated within or linked to local planning issues via local consultative committees or working parties.

On the whole this process in Moss Side probably permitted access by a wider range of local interests, particularly in race and gender terms, than in Gorton North. At the same time it was local pressure, especially from the 1981 riots and from groups in which black residents and women were active, that helped to create the slightly opened process form in Moss Side. The Gorton Labour Party mechanisms created a broad based and forceful voice, but one that inevitably excluded competing conceptions of the district.

Again simplifying, experiences in the Leeds areas did not match closely either of the above models. Harehills was somewhat nearer to the Moss Side type, but in the 1980s more successfully linked into the Labour Party machine (as the Bansteads and Rank Optics cases show). Richmond Hill was more like a failed version of both models, often poorly fitted into the council machine and only occasionally able to exert effective oppositional pressure.

In terms of outcomes the differences were less evident suggesting the force of wider circumstances in constraining possible results. In both areas gains broadly emerging from the 1969/71 plans were slowly but eventually secured, in many cases. The gains were partially similar because of the overall circumstances of public funding and commercial non/disinvestment, and the common features of

Labour council politics.

Some outcomes differed for reasons simply related to the stages of redevelopment - that the Moss Side District Centre was completed 8 years before that in Gorton North for example; or to the overall spatial location - the Gore Brook Valley scheme on the edge of the Manchester built-up area. The first of these had clear parallels in Richmond Hill, in that there as well much of the western section's fate had been decided in the pre-1974 era and this had a different process of planning and implementation and a different product.

## 2. The Effects of City Differences

In Chapter 4 the way in which the differences between the two cities affected the local planning approach was analysed. In the case studies the effect in turn of these general approaches was examined; overall they did set the normal processes in each area, but with some variation in each episode or issue arising from local circumstances.

In each episode the influence of these broader factors was also visible, affecting both processes and outcomes - the more enduring and larger scale municipal commitment to public programmes in Manchester, the more radical political turn in Manchester after 1984, the retail interest more evident in Leeds affecting Harehills in the early 1980s. But the fact that, as Chapter 4 made clear, the cities had many similarities, was one reason for the often similar outcomes and processes - the generally centralised council structure, the normally low level of commercial pressure, the overall decline in most public programmes from the late 1970s.

The complex cross-cutting of both area and city differences and similarities meant that what actually happened in each case did not vary regularly between area and city. It is true that there were more similarities between several of the episodes in Moss Side and Harehills, than between these and the episodes in the other district of the same city. For example the way the Princess Road scheme was contested had a parallel in the Harehills struggles over the Roundhay Road (A 57 - this was excluded from detailed discussion; it resulted in some local gains, L 22,L 23). In so far as there was a tendency in this respect it resulted from the community action

tradition in each district and the greater pressure this gave to participatory forms of interaction between local residents and council officials (and councillors), beyond the traditional intra-party and electoral mechanisms more dominant in Richmond Hill and Gorton North. Though very far from identical Moss Side and Harehills had somewhat similar local political cultures. And both gained (though Moss Side more) from the effect of the 1981 riots - in the case of Harehills through its border with Chapeltown.

This is not to make a systematic generalisation that because of the local social relations in Moss Side and Harehills all episodes had similarities in this way - it depended on the specific circumstances of each case - spatial location, ownerships, period in which the issue came to a head, structuring of the provision of the sector(s) involved (industry, road building etc).

The most influential planning frameworks in each city were without doubt the late 1960s/early 1970s plans, whether of revised Development Plan form as in Leeds or the slightly more detailed local briefs or plans in Manchester. This was related to the much stronger push of public programmes and resourcing behind the frameworks, although in some cases the broad sweep born of earlier programming confidence carried the provisions of these frameworks well into eras when resources were not available in the same manner - in Gorton North and in parts of Moss Side and Richmond Hill. The later local exercises in Leeds only had a limited force in constraining land use changes. Several key decisions in all areas were in both the 1970s and the 1980s taken outside any explicit area framework, although the awareness of the earlier plans and various forms of area oriented consideration were guiding elements for local planners - through HAAs or GIAs, through Inner Area Programmes, through internal district policy documents (in Manchester), through some preparatory work on District Plans (in Leeds). But in virtually all the cases council-wide policies were major elements in the resolution of the issues. The presence of very active local councillors at key moments in three of the four areas (and an insurgent Liberal period in the fourth) was a significant factor in each case, outweighing the effect of local planning process forms.

The capacity of local residents to influence the broader forces affecting their areas was not generally great, in the episodes studied here. Their influence was

increased if some form of community or non-electoral action was combined with close links with local political parties and councillors, whether by turning to another party as in Richmond Hill, by putting up community based candidates as in Moss Side in the 1970s or by pressing directly on Labour councillors. Equally, building up close contacts with council officials could be helpful, but this depended on the location of such officials within the council machine and whether they had control over important resources - the local renewal offices in Manchester generally lacked such control. How far one or more of these tactics worked was seen to depend on the issue - its timing, its spatial insertion in the area and how provision was structured (whether publicly like road building, mainly privately as in retailing or industry). A necessary ingredient was what a non-academic might call 'luck', which in each episode could be analysed into an infinite number of contingencies, about the characteristics of sites, of individual residents, councillors and officials, timing in relation to elections and the availability of finance - and so on.

At the broadest level one can conclude that each episode represented a different combining of local and more general contingencies, sometimes drawing on significant local 'causal' force, often strongly structured by powerful outside pressures. It was because of these circumstances that the issues could rarely be subjected to control within area frameworks for any significant period into the future - and thus planners (and others) fought shy of attempting such exercises, except in Leeds at one stage, as limited "campaigns" centred around a key issue. The avoidance of 'local plans' had its logic.

Figure 14

**SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS - 1981 CENSUS**  
**(EDs IN STUDY AREAS: ALL PERCENTAGE FIGURES EXCEPT**  
**POPULATION TOTAL, HOUSEHOLDS TOTAL AND WORKING**  
**MARRIED WOMEN TOTAL)**

CHARACTERISTICS	GORTON NORTH	MOSS SIDE
Population total	9227	14031
0-4 years	6.0	7.6
5-15 years	15.6	18.0
16-24 years	13.7	17.6
25-34 years	12.8	13.8
35-44 years	10.3	9.8
45-Pensioners	19.6	18.3
Pensioners	21.9	14.8
1 year migrants	9.7	12.6
Total households	3621	5168
Mrd cple + cdn	17.8	15.8
Mrd cple no cdn	22.7	16.5
Lone pensioner	19.8	14.4
Other lone adults	7.5	12.6
Lone parents	2.2	5.4
Other h/h types	30.0	35.4
Hsehlds, 3+ cdn	5.5	8.7
Lone pensioners, 75+	7.9	5.9
No car hsehlds	62.2	69.5
Nos in UK born headed h/h	94.7	59.1
Nos in IR born headed h/h	3.0	13.7
Nos in NCP born headed h/h	1.0	24.9
Born UK	96.7	77.2
Born IR	1.8	7.7
Born NCP	0.6	13.3
NCP no car h/ds	45.0	64.7

CHARACTERISTICS	GORTON NORTH	MOSS SIDE
Male unemployed	14.5	26.1
Female unemployed	9.4	16.0
Youth unemployed	21.6	36.3
Wkg mrd women with cdm 0-4	110 women	170 women
Owner occupied	60.6	46.6
Council rented	20.1	18.3
Hsg Assoc/Empl.	5.1	10.7
Private (unfurn)	13.4	18.2
Private (furn)	0.7	6.1

Source 1981 Census

Figure 15

# **LOCAL PLANNING PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES IN SELECTED EPISODES INGORTON NORTH AND MOSS SIDE**

Episodes	Local Planning Processes	Local Planning Outcomes
<b><u>Gorton North</u></b>		
Gorton District Centre (shops)	Primarily within official mechanisms, backed by central political processes, with little local resident influence except via councillors.	Mixed - useful market and supermarket but much of shopping centre unattractive and not prospering by late 1980s.
Hyde Road Scheme	Mainly within official and central political processes.	Blighting effect of road affected parts of district for many years.
Hyde Road sites	Up to final years within council official circles primarily; 1985-86 increased central councillor control, and some public consultation.	Gradual provision of community facilities by late 1980s - library, swimming pool, neighbourhood offices, police station; no commercial development.
Gore Brook Valley	Within official channels, though with local councillor and resident occasional involvement.	By late 1980s Park nearing completion.
Infill sites within core of district	Primarily within official clearance and housing infill or facilities decision making processes - occasional public comment/response. Little affected by GIA/HAA processes.	Gradual infilling of sites created by end of clearance process, to local advantage, normally with community facilities or council housing.
<b><u>Moss Side</u></b>		
Moss Side Shopping Precinct	Within senior council circles, both in construction and in decision to purchase; in 1980s some public involvement in management via Moss Side Neighbourhood Consultative Committee.	Unsuccessful scheme, but rescued through council acquisition, so providing some useful shops and accommodation for council offices and social projects.
Princess Road Scheme	Some public involvement in altering scale and design of widening scheme, linked to officials and councillors decision making.	Blight on houses for many years, eventually scheme carried out with some local sensitivity, though still dividing district.
Quinney Crescent Exercise	Despite full public involvement decisions during study period remained primarily with officials and, to extent, councillors.	Nothing implemented on land during study period, except landscaping scheme.

Walmer Street allocations	Normally official or central councillor decision making, although public consultation occurring at certain stages.	Final provision for council housing, neighbourhood office, children's centre and commercial development broadly favourable to many local residents.
Royal Brewery Expansion	Some local public and councillor involvement, partly via Neighbourhood Consultative Committee, as well as central political and officer influence.	Loss of residential accommodation, but with some jobs going to Moss Side residents.
Infill sites within core of district	Some public involvement, especially via Inner City Ward Committee, in early 1980s; before that mainly official and central political processes.	Generally gains in local facilities and public/social rented housing for local residents.



Figure 16

**INFLUENCE OF SELECTED FACTORS ON PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES OF LOCAL PLANNING IN PARTICULAR EPISODES IN GORTON NORTH AND MOSS SIDE**

Episodes	Citywide Planning Approach	Local Planning Approach	Public Programmes	Private Investment Levels	Role of Professionals/ Officials	Role of Councillors	Local Physical/ Spatial Relations	Local Social Relations
Gorton District Centre (shops)	Mainly reflecting citywide approach, though with larger local councillor input.	Markets element and overall District Centre's programme helped project, whilst absence of municipal shop building did not.	Just enough private interest to secure development, but not enough to secure high quality or large size.	Councillor professionals controlled greater part of process.	Some significant role in progressing project 1978-79, though probably not central.	Difficulty of site between changing roadline and housing areas made development harder.	Little input by local interests except via local councillors.	
Hyde Road scheme	After 1969 brief, mainly held outside local planning discussion - as normal in Manchester.	Reduction of road programme encouraged revision and delay of scheme.	Not relevant directly.	Controlled primarily by professionals, especially engineers, in city and county councils.	Some input in reducing extent of scheme.	Little affected by surroundings, given overall large scale conception.	Local interests exerted little effective pressure on project, probably due to disinterest and sense of remoteness of scheme.	
Hyde Road sites	Each phase of planning and implementing broadly reflected citywide approach.	Type and size of public, mainly municipal programmes dictated timing and use of land.	Weak commercial pressure led to non-development by private interest, except petrol filling station.	Mainly controlled process within council up to 1984.	Local councillors apparently only limited role; after 1984 central councillors dominant in deciding major uses.	Some problems from road line shifts but redevelopment gave useful range of sites.	Fairly limited public involvement even after 1984 when public opinions consulted rather more extensively.	

Core Brook Valley	As above	Nature of park project meant public funding central.	Private ownership of much of land held upon implementation, but relatively weak commercial interests limited this resistance and costs to council in most cases.	Mainly initiated and progressed by officials, within amenity and conservation approach.	Supporting but limited role.	Physically inherited potential and problems of scheme to significant extent.	Fairly weak degree of interest amongst local residents, limited involvement.
Infill sites within core of district	Treatment reflected ad hoc approach, with only weak links to HAA/GIA process.	Mainly dictated by needs and pressure of public programmes, of housing clearance and house building.	Little commercial pressure meant that decisions mainly within public sector.	Central official groupings mainly responsible for decisions, though Housing Department local team with some involvement.	Only sporadic role on most of issues.	Small scale, scattered nature of sites meant little linking and low priority for progression.	Only limited involvement, partly due to weak holds outside statutory clearance and acquisition processes.
Moss Side Shopping Precinct	Original decision within overall city plan; later, management issues.	Major commitment of council through purchase and location of public facilities.	Absence of commercial attractiveness (after initial development decision) led to municipal takeover.	Given high political profile, more limited influence on main issues.	Central councillors in control of major decisions.	Affected by division of Moss Side by main road, but otherwise large scale of redevelopment remained constraints.	Little effect on original scheme or acquisition, some partial in management in 1980s, via Consultative Committee (and effect of Riots).
Princess Road scheme	Followed normal approach but in more open form.	Early commitment of funding required early resolution of scale of scheme.	Not directly relevant	Significant involvement	Key role, both city and county level, in deciding revised scheme.	Given early creation of corridor, not constraining.	Local organised pressure important in opening up process and influencing outcome.

Quiney Crescent Exercise	Reflected more open consultative approach of 1981 onwards, outside area framework.	Competition for public funds cut chances of success of any more expensive schemes (beyond landscaping).	Weak demand for retail premises reduced chances of residents' proposals.	Important roles in discouraging adoption of residents schemes (outside Planning Department).	Influential in opposing residents proposals, as well as (locally) supporting exercise.	'Left-over' nature of site limited development options greatly.	Local involvement not strong enough to secure desired schemes.
Walmer Street allocations	Reflected successive stages of general approach closely.	Dominated by the (non) availability of public funding on most of site.	Just sufficient commercial interest to launch one scheme, but not enough to cause further pressure.	Dominated early stages of allocations, up to at least 1984.	Controlled final two allocations in 1986, at central level.	Only limited constraints given location and size of site, though position in shopping centre guided main road use.	Relatively weak pressure to control uses in area, despite requests for community centre in 1979-80.
Royal Brewery expansion	Pressure opened out to public debate, to greater extent than normal.	Only relevant in sense that land sale could contribute to city finances.	Commercial pressure in priority area strongly pushed for expansion.	Generally favourable attitude supported scheme.	Favoured scheme and controlled decision, including local gains on jobs.	Difficulty of expanding on site surrounded by new housing set form of conflict.	Active response, especially from local agencies and some political groups - but not enough to prevent scheme.
Infill sites within core of district	Mainly reflected non-area framework approach, though slight cohering in ICWC/CTAC exercise 1984-85.	Dominated development of sites through housing, schools and open space programmes.	Absence of interest left area clear to public sector.	Controlled most of process though central inter-department processes, though occasional local team influence.	Significant role of most active councillors, especially in 1980s.	Wide range of cases prevents generalisation.	Some public involvement in range of issues, but normally not very extensive.

## **CHAPTER 7            CONCLUSIONS**

### **A        Introduction**

### **B        Case Study Conclusions**

1.        What created the forms of local planning?
2.        What effects did local planning have on outcomes?
3.        The use of channels of influence by local actors

### **C        Two Examples of Alternative Local Planning Processes**

1.        Changed Institutional Forms
2.        Changed Interest Involvement

### **D        Implications for Local Planning of the New Housing Renewal Provisions**

### **E        Some Ingredients for More Responsive Local Planning**

## CHAPTER 7      CONCLUSIONS

### A      Introduction

This final chapter will be primarily concerned with the discussion of plausible prescription, for inner residential area local planning. For this purpose it will be necessary first to summarise the lessons from the Leeds and Manchester case studies. A very prominent feature in both cities was the quite limited use of spatial forward planning frameworks during most of the period, especially from 1974 onwards. The forces conditioning this, and conditioning the non-local planning, or local non-planning, which generally predominated, have been analysed. These are summarised in Sections B1 and B2. These point towards the conditions which would be needed to facilitate local planning in these areas. To imagine how such planning might be more specifically oriented to local interests, the channels used by these interests in the case studies are summarised in Section B3. This issue of the responsiveness provided by available channels leads on to consideration of varying planning processes, especially those related to institutional changes and interest involvement. To explore this further two experiences of decentralisation and planning consultation are briefly examined.

The 1990s will witness a changed context in at least one respect, the new arrangements for residential renewal introduced in 1990. Suggestions are made as to how local planning may be affected by these circumstances, before indicating desirable broader changes in the dimensions of inner residential area local planning.

## B Case Study Conclusions

### 1. What created the forms of local planning?

#### (a) Citywide Approaches

In Chapter 3 it was proposed that the joint variation of a set of factors could be used to explain the differing city approaches to local planning. It was suggested that the most common state of some of these factors could explain the general tendency against formalised local planning in older inner residential areas; but it was proposed also that there was sufficient variation in the factors to account to different degrees of distancing from formal local planning.

Chapter 4 observed the evolution of local planning in Leeds and Manchester, noting only relatively limited differences between the approaches in each city. Figure 17 shows in summary form the general pattern along each local planning dimension and the situations in Leeds and Manchester, and also in Birmingham and Liverpool as significantly contrasting cases.

Neither Leeds nor Manchester adopted strongly decentralised forms and neither consistently sought to involve local interests in local planning, though on occasions moves were made in both directions in both cities; Leeds did make more use of localised frameworks at times. This limited variation was explained primarily by differences in the public programmes (with slightly more vigour in Leeds in the rehabilitation and inner area programmes), in the political complexions of the councils and in the professional orientations of senior officers. The similarities rested on the quite powerful and similar economic and political structuring affecting both cities, reducing the scope for agents to develop approaches other than the relatively scattered use of guidance frameworks. Nevertheless planning professionals did try to develop forms of co-ordination and area guidance; in Manchester they had little success after 1974, in Leeds slightly more, at least during one phase at the end of the 1970s.

This explanation thus brings to life the framework proposed in Chapter 3 and

presents an analysis of a more comprehensive form, over a longer timescale, than those to be found in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. The explanation was tied to some degree to the evolving understandings of city and localities. This was not always easy, as the relation of one primarily municipal task (local planning) to such broad concepts as class alliances or the pro-activeness of localities is not simply established. There is much scope for the further analysis of how the major English cities have adapted their planning strategies in response to the changing pressures and opportunities facing them. Figure 17 is a reminder of the very different evolution in two other key histories, Birmingham and Liverpool.

Of course in terms of outcomes the approaches were only as useful as their application in concrete cases allowed. The essential next step was therefore to examine such cases in detail, to see how they were shaped and with what effects.

#### (b) Neighbourhood Planning

In Chapter 2 it was argued that the existing studies of local planning in older residential areas presented a picture of weak influence of neighbourhood actors; but it was suggested that this was based on only limited detailed work and that a fuller and more convincing analysis would result from further investigation. Chapter 3 described variations in the factors which would tend towards greater or lesser influence for local actors, in the second stage of the framework presented there. This represented a complex set of ingredients, some 'structural' but with locally contingent variation, some causally active from within each area.

The combination of these ingredients in specific episodes or over particular issues was then analysed in the four study areas. Some generalisation as to the formation of local planning in these areas in the study period is possible. Much of the time the planning undertaken locally was constrained strongly both by the overall approach citywide and by the main structuring economic and political forces contingently affecting the area. But there was some very local influence on the local planning adopted, and this meant that there was some 'causal' variation between planning approaches adopted, not just in each area but on each issue, and at different stages of each issue.

Thus for example all the areas were influenced considerably by the nature of their local councillors, but Gorton North had a local planning process set much more firmly within a party, trade union and councillor dominated framework. Moss Side, and to a lesser extent Harehills, had more active 'local civil societies' than the other two areas, but these only changed, partially, the locally planning process in exceptional circumstances, such as after the Moss Side riots. In that case new or rejuvenated consultative forms affected some of the local planning episodes in the following years.

In Moss Side too there was the strongest tendency for 'local social professionals' to influence local planning; in the absence of a decentralised municipal administration in both cities these non-municipal (but often municipally funded) actors had a significant effect in mediating certain very local interests. Sometimes these actors operated within relatively closed forms, as in the Richmond Hill Advisory Group, sometimes in more public forums, as in the Harehills Community Liaison Group or the Moss Side consultative groups - in Gorton North this kind of mediation did not exist, outside rather tranquil residents' groups.

The role and influence of the individual planners was not analysed in detail, for the purposes of considering the possibility that officials could take on a significant 'substituting' role where other interests lacked force. But the evidence of the four areas studied is that, at least in the late 1970s and the 1980s, the individual approaches of planners were only secondary contributing factors. Thus it is true that there were differences between the planners dealing with Gorton North and Moss Side, but this was probably partly the result of the deliberate allocation of staff to particular area teams, choosing 'more consultative' planners for Moss Side. No doubt this contributed to the approach in each district, but far from instigated it. In Leeds the same local planners dealt with both areas most of the period, so the differences cannot be attributed just to this factor; the influence of other factors must be important in explaining the differences, although the predisposition of planners to respond to very local circumstances certainly mattered in Leeds, as in Manchester.

As far as planning instruments were concerned, none of the very local forces



changed the general tendency, after the early 1970s Manchester 'redevelopment briefs', to 'continuous' forms dominated by officials and, usually, central and/or local councillors. The frameworks of 1978-81 in the Leeds areas were only partial exceptions to this general tendency, given their only modest success in settling all the land use decisions in each area. The content of this 'continuous' or ad hoc local planning was then determined above all by the structure of provision of the matter at issue, by the available resources, and by the physical and spatial constraints or opportunities of the land parcels or buildings. The latter, important in many of the episodes studied, constituted a further element of very local circumstances (in addition to local actors) of some significance. But the way in which provision of say roads or housing was structured was normally set mainly by 'higher level' forces, within which the 'causal' variation of local actors and the 'contingent' variation of physical - spatial circumstances then played.

Broadly speaking then the formula adopted by Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) is confirmed by these studies as a useful one, if extended 'downwards' to include neighbourhood circumstances. This formula suggested, schematically, that within the overall economic conditions of a city and its political-ideological colouring in each period, the planning approach was set by the interplay of specific institutional, process and interest configurations. The studies in Chapters 5 and 6 suggested that much of these configurations did operate at the citywide or 'higher' levels, but that neighbourhood actors or circumstances could on occasions make significant differences to the local planning process.

## 2. What effects did local planning have on outcomes?

It was suggested in Chapter 2 that differences in local planning appeared, from the limited existing studies, to have had only weak impacts on differences in outcomes, although this varied between periods and within particular circumstances. Study of these circumstances, it was argued, might lead to the identification of neighbourhood level factors as of significance for the kind of impacts achieved.

Broadly speaking the conclusion of the studies in Chapters 5 and 6 was that very local factors did have some effect on the planning - implementation link - but that

often they were not the dominant force. More general factors relating to resources, private and public, often mattered more. Thus the observation that similarly 'good' or 'bad' outcomes for local interests could result from differing local planning approaches reflected the importance of these other factors in implementing planning proposals. The planning process form differed between the more open consultative style in Moss Side and the more closed party based type in Gorton North - but in both areas implementation often remained slow, with significant projects to be completed in 1986. Nevertheless in certain cases the opening to more interests in Moss Side was likely to lead to outcomes more beneficial to more varied local interests; which those certain cases were (the District Centre management, the brewery jobs guarantee, the small scale play and amenity spaces) depended on the additional presence of other factors, especially the political will and the resource options for adequate implementation.

Equally in Harehills achievements satisfactory to differing local interests (the community centre especially for the elderly, the park especially for mothers and their children, the Rank Optics allocation for Muslims' use) reflected varying kinds of pressure within varying local planning process forms (respectively, within traditional residents association activity, in more politicised and open local campaigning and in close party - mosque linking). The relatively beneficial outcomes for these local interests only depended in part on the local planning process - many other 'structural' and historical-spatial factors made the achievements possible.

For the same reason it is not possible to generalise as to whether the greater use of area frameworks would have led to outcomes more beneficial to local interests. When used at the appropriate moment, as in Harehills in 1980-81 or in a part of Moss Side in 1984-86, such use did benefit more local actors, thanks to the political and official interest in the areas at this time and the consequent securing of resources. It is possible that a similar exercise in Gorton North would have been beneficial in widening the play of local pressure on the remaining local decisions. But both there and in Richmond Hill the necessary political, official and public support was no doubt lacking, both to carry out the exercises and to translate the results into implemented schemes.

It may be noted that such an explanation fits easily with the 'realist' approaches discussed in Appendix 3. One cannot say that structuring mechanisms will, in any particular circumstance, lead to specific outcomes. A general tendency to weak or slow implementation may be noted, due to private and public disinterest or disinvestment, but the contingent operation of these forces in each area, and the causal variation created by locally active interests, can both divert or modify this tendency. A certain local planning process may be observed to have helped certain local interests in one episode - but one cannot deduce that it will be helpful to these interests in other circumstances, irrespective of the broad range of factors always in play.

In particular several of the episodes studied showed the importance of timing (and, one might say, 'spacing' - understanding the spatial insertion of each case) in effective progression of the issues. The fate of specific sites or buildings was decided in part by the way in which actors (both planners and locally active residents) were able to grasp the relevant spatial externalities to which they gave rise and secure resources and political attention in order to implement schemes. There were certain moments when issues could be progressed quickly, or when decisions on whole areas became manageable, when earlier no movement had appeared likely. These shifts were due to complex interweavings of temporal and spatial contingencies, which required actors to be rich in information both at the very local and at higher levels.

In these ways then the weakness and variability of the local planning-outcomes link was confirmed, but with the specific addition that part of the variability did result from very local circumstances. In other words no fixed link between planning process forms and outcomes was observed, just a range of connections determined by circumstances, some at neighbourhood level. This would hardly be a surprising conclusion to local planners, who are accustomed as much to the peculiarities of each case as to the structuring constraints within which they operate. But its formal statement carries implications for prescription - especially for the design of process forms appropriate to both the localised and the structuring circumstances.

Much of the value that is present in this study must lie in the general understandings it presents of the multiple and interrelated causation of the phenomena studied, rather than in any direct policy recommendations. It is far from easy to move from the case study conclusions towards prescription of changes promoting or facilitating better practice. This partly results from the 'joint-factor' form of explanation adopted, which emphasises the complexity of conditioning and causation: that it depends on circumstances as to whether a change in A, or in A and B, or in A, B and C, will be adequate to improve practice. Up to now one can summarise, in the baldest and most over-simplified form, the conclusions:-

- 1)      that the key economic and political structures constrain to a significant extent the choices of key citywide actors, on local planning, - but they do sometimes have some scope;
- 2)      that neighbourhood planning is affected by very localised circumstances, but only sporadically and under only occasionally occurring contingencies; often much stronger and broader forces constrain action - hence discouraging attempts at all forward planning local frameworks;
- 3)      that outcomes only depended in part, and again contingently, on planning processes - many other, broader factors mattered more, on most occasions; nevertheless in some circumstances local interests could exploit helpful forms of planning process to make gains.

These are hardly a recipe for making a very firm list of recommendations. From them can be extracted the following points:-

- a)      for local planning to have a chance, many wider economic and political structuring forces have to be changed;
- b)      local planning has to be very alert to occasional and unique contingencies;

- c) for local planning to be more responsive to local interests, it would have to increase the power of those interests in some ways, as well as provide adequate planning processes.

Again these are still at a high level of generality. But they do point to one facet of possible change, in planning processes, which will be examined further before making more general proposals. From the case studies it is possible to make some generalisation about the observed usefulness of different channels of influence for local interests. Figure 18 relates channels, episodes/cases, and outcomes, with some of the supporting or hindering factors. The broadest category of everyday, ad hoc contact with officials or councillors was inevitably present in the majority of cases, and clearly covers many varying activities and contributes to action via other channels. It is a genuinely separate channel, but one hard to study.

Broadly Figure 18 shows, perhaps not surprisingly, that where pressure was initiated by residents directly this was more effective than the officially initiated ad hoc public meetings or public design exercises. But more durable and institutionalised channels, as in GIA schemes, public inquiries, Consultative Committees or official - councillor - resident working groups, also tended to allow local interests more leverage. In all cases such influence depended significantly on contextual or related factors (not all of which are included in the figure).

Evidence as to who was able to participate effectively via these channels was not systematically sought across all the cases. However the general picture from the studies is that the ability to take part in the more demanding forms of participation existed mainly in either the more highly educated/middle class residents (in the Leeds areas) or in those active in one of the organised groups - churches, mosques, Trades club, voluntary organisations, political parties. Such a conclusion simply reinforces the suggestion that the forms of the channels are likely to be important (as the literature on women's and black participation argues) and that community development (encouraging local organisation) matters in the opening up of these channels.

If one had to advise neighbourhood actors on tactics on the basis of the case

studies, one might recommend either the extreme of disorganisation (riots) or the more conventional forms of formal electoral politics and participation from the base of local clubs and churches, supported by local social professionals. All the areas gained something in these ways, and those who gained most were those who used most extensively a combination of all these channels. Given the prime decision-making arrangement in these areas (perhaps best described as bureaucratic - sectoral bargaining), it was natural that either a very powerful external stimulus like riots, or various techniques specifically designed for penetrating these public sector decision and allocation processes, would be the most effective formulas.

This type of linking of channels, actors and outcomes is always risky, given the importance of the full range of factors in each case. But it lends support to the idea that durable, institutionalised channels and locally initiated action and organisation are both necessary for effective influence - and thus that planning processes should aspire to build in these elements.

Again these ideas are evidently far from original, and planners, among others, have sought to put them into practice in many situations in the 1970s and 1980s. For many they have pointed to strategies for municipal decentralisation and community involvement. There are several initiatives which one could examine to obtain pointers as to what may 'work' under varying circumstances: for example the GLC's Community Areas project (see Allen 1986, CHICL 1986 and Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989), or the general decentralisation schemes of Tower Hamlets or Islington London Boroughs, which have extensive but mainly unstudied implications for local planning (see Morphet, 1986A, 1986B and 1987, Burns 1988 and Tomlinson 1989). In the next section two cases will be briefly surveyed, in order to cast more light on the value of significant attempts at institutional change (in Birmingham) and interest involvement (in Newham). This will move a little further in establishing the conditions for improved local planning.

## **C Two Examples of Alternative Local Planning Processes**

### **1. Changed Institutional Forms**

Leeds and Manchester councils had traditional, centralised administrative and political forms throughout the study period, although with secondary elements of decentralisation, such as the housing renewal offices in Manchester from 1975 and the housing management offices in Leeds from 1984.

Birmingham on the other hand changed its management of a key part of public programmes at an early stage. The Birmingham model stemmed from calls from the community action tradition in the late 1960s and early 1970s for planners and others to get close to the areas being tackled (Sources are recorded in Note 1 at the end of the chapter). Gibson and Langstaff (1982 p 225-8) describe the setting up of the new machinery in 1972-75, to complement the new urban renewal programme. It involved eight local teams led by the Environmental Health Department, with other departments, including Planning, seconding officials to work in the teams. The local planning approach was strongly influenced by this administrative structure and the commitment it entailed to extensive local consultation in decisions on each urban renewal area. Normally local land use plans were drawn up for each Housing Action Area or General Improvement Area. These plans, given their generally long period of production and longer period of implementation (and often revision), represented to some degree 'continuous' local planning, based on lengthy interaction between residents and other local interests, locally based officials and central departments. These departments, including the otherwise centralised Planning Department, retained much of the control over planning proposals, given central funding and committee decision making.

However, through the three elements of partial decentralisation, the use of area frameworks and the commitment to consultation with local interests, the local planning process was significantly changed, and was significantly different from that in Leeds or Manchester. The systematic nature of the model meant that the citywide approach was put into practice in each area, although to very varying degrees depending on the local circumstances of officials, local councillors, resident

activity and the physical and spatial inheritance. The result was that planning decisions generally represented a balance between central council, local team and local resident (or other) interests, depending on the range of circumstances in each area or episode.

Healey et al's study (1988) concluded from examination of one Birmingham neighbourhood that the local planning process was often not able to secure rapid or effective implementation. Given the multiple priorities within the council, this is not a surprising conclusion; the author's experience of work in the urban renewal programme would suggest that this difficulty of link between local planning process and outcomes was common in the years 1976-85. In the absence of further detailed studies it is not possible to be definite as to how far local interests were able to benefit from a process which gave them a somewhat more privileged position. It seems probable that, despite the continuing strength of the central council machine and its priorities, those interests that came to be expressed locally did achieve outcomes favourable to themselves. As noted in Healey et al (1988 p 95) these expressed interests often over represented white, older residents, though this was by no means always the case. It depended in part on the kind of community development work undertaken during these years, which varied very much from one neighbourhood to another.

Thus, as usual, securing of outcomes beneficial to very local interests depended not only on a range of other factors operating in the council generally but also on the extent of expression of these interests, partly dependent on council or other public/community agency activity. In any case the continuous working together of locally based officials in Birmingham's chosen institutional form facilitated the possibility of locally responsive planning.

## 2. Changed Interest Involvement

Much of the logic of institutional change in Birmingham was to allow greater public contact, and so possibly greater public participation in local planning. Often though planners have sought to change the involvement of local interests within a traditional council structure. Recent examples include the Central Newham Local



Plan and the plan for the central area of Sheffield (see Alty and Darke 1987 and Darke 1988). These two cases share in particular a common concern for positive discrimination, that is efforts to involve groups normally excluded or inactive. The Newham case will be examined here briefly, as it covers to a degree inner residential areas (the study context) as against the central area treated in Sheffield. As Darke notes (1988 p 7) contexts other than central areas may have "greater scope for local control and policy making because decisions are likely to have less of a city-wide or strategic impact", and the constituencies or groups affected are likely to be more easily identified and involved.

Following the normal London pattern, Newham sought full statutory plan coverage, although more unusually this entailed five Local Plans, of which Central Newham was the last (Sources are recorded in Note 2 at the end of the chapter). The factors permitting the unconventional nature of the planning exercise were, as usual, multiple. There were very few large scale land use issues in the district, so that policies related either to small sites or to changes of use or lesser physical changes to existing buildings or facilities. Neither major public programmes nor strong private development pressure affected the district. This left clear the possibility of experimenting within a relatively safe context. As the planners involved concluded (Best and Bowser 1986 p25), there were then four ingredients needed for carrying out the resulting exercise - some committed planners, some support from interested councillors, the help of some local agencies and the presence of enthusiastic members of the community. The exercise was very much professional led, primarily by local planners who obtained varying degrees of support from elsewhere in their department and in other 'social' departments of the council; but it required also the particular political moment (1984-86) when some Labour Left councillors had some influence in Newham and wished to pursue new 'popular planning' approaches.

The distinguishing feature of the plan was the objective of colouring the policies with social goals favourable especially to weaker groups - ethnic minorities and women perhaps most of all, but embracing many other interests - youth, handicapped, elderly, unemployed, under fives, amongst others. This was done by a number of means - surveys, discussion groups, school projects, and, most

centrally, through ten working parties which produced a 'Social Audit'. This covered issues much broader than a normal Local Plan, and led to a Draft Community Strategy, with the parts most relevant to planning policies fed into the draft Local Plan in March 1986, about 2 years after the start of the exercise.

The Social Audit appears to have been a generally successful attempt to obtain the views of interests often excluded from participation in planning. It evidently involved an intensive input of planners' time, and the energies of many other 'social professionals' in and outside the council. Given the availability of these people's time, and of active community members, the technique is no doubt applicable in some other circumstances. However it may be noted that subsequently in 1986-87 it proved very hard to reassemble any of the Working Parties; this suggests the difficulty of 'one-off' community development exercises of this kind, not tied in to any more durable institutional structure.

The uniqueness of the exercise also was no doubt partly responsible for its subsequent problems within the council. Whilst in April 1986 the Draft Local Plan was approved by the Management Board, the Draft Community Strategy was seen as threatening and effectively progressed no further. Planners considered that many points from the Social Audit were picked up by both councillors and officials within the new service programmes; overall it helped, they felt, along with the new type of councillor, to establish the need for greater council responsiveness across all services. But its specific output was rejected by the council's traditional council form and so the broader outcomes would be very hard to trace.

The Local Plan finally progressed to adoption in January 1989, after further public consultations in 1986 and a Public Local Inquiry to deal with a few objections in 1988. The Inspector commented on the width of definition of land use issues, but did not request the deletion of any of the elements stemming from the Social Audit. The Plan bears clear marks of its process of production, with policies having in many cases strong community and positive discrimination elements. Any full evaluation would eventually have to trace how far these policies have been translated into actual outcomes. These outcomes will have depended in major part on a range of both very local and 'structural' circumstances affecting

implementation, in addition to the approach to local planning embodied in the plan.

In several respects the Newham experience shows both the potential and the difficulties of new forms of interest involvement in local planning. The exercise was made easier in some ways by the general nature of the policies sought, lending itself to the district wide working party approach. But only a situation with the stated conditions of sufficient committed planners, politicians and public could allow such an exercise, and even then such a relatively brief form of community development had its limits. In terms of the kind of issues addressed, the Plan was more like Birmingham's district wide Inner Area Studies than area plans dealing with particular sites. It would be extremely resource intensive to carry out an approach of this kind for each small area, although with suitable adaptation to local circumstances something similar would normally be feasible. As always progression would depend both on the existence of expressed local interests, probably benefiting from enduring community development work, and on the support within the council as a whole for the results emerging from such interest expression. In Newham these conditions were present only in part, at least enough to produce a statutory plan which reflected to a degree the local planning approach adopted.

#### **D      Implications for Local Planning of the New Housing Renewal Provisions**

These brief accounts of experience in Birmingham and Newham, very different though they have been, both suggest the opportunities as well as the difficulties in creating a suitable combination of 'ingredients' for more responsive local planning. In Birmingham the partially decentralised institutional structure and the commitment to some degree of involvement for neighbourhood actors went some way to benefitting local interests - as far as one can tell from the limited studies undertaken. In Newham too the concentrated effort to consult fully local interests affected, up to a point, the resulting local planning policies. These point clearly to elements of local planning which can be advocated for wider use, along with the range of helpful channels identified from the Leeds and Manchester cases.

There have been proposals from various sources in the 1980s which would have incorporated some of these elements. For example the GLC and subsequently the Labour Party called for 'Public Action Zones', with greater powers for certain combinations of councils and community groups (see Newman 1988 on the evolution of the proposal). The Town and Country Planning Association advocated 'Community Planning Zones', giving greater influence to community interests within various forms of partnership (TCPA 1986).

The twin aims in these schemes are to facilitate public intervention, particularly by allowing land purchase for 'social' purposes at below market value, and to give rights of information and involvement (in varying forms) to community interests. Much would depend on how far the definitions of interests and rights could be made firm enough. But it is possible to think of cases in Leeds and Manchester where such changes would have been helpful - the purchase powers in the Rank Optics case, the rights to information and involvement on the road schemes, the brewery expansion and perhaps the Gorton District Centre. So far such community access has depended on the goodwill of the council, or other public agency, concerned - often considerable in recent years but never to be guaranteed.

Currently, in 1990, no such reform of planning instruments is in prospect. What is now creating a change in older residential areas, potentially affecting all the dimensions of local planning, is the new system of housing renewal introduced under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. This constitutes a significant revision in the management of the most important programme affecting these areas. Before moving to prescription, the potential of the new system will be discussed.

As far as one can tell from the Circulars available (primarily, Circular 6/90 of March 1990, Department of the Environment), the implications for each dimension of local planning are as follows:

- 1) content/objectives - the aims of action by councils are set broadly, to 'regenerate' areas using "a broader based area strategy which may include environmental and socio-economic regeneration (Circular 6/90 p.5). This is more extensive than was proposed with the introduction of HAAs (or

GIAs), and recalls the aspirations for comprehensive planning of the early 1970s. Nevertheless another key objective is involvement of the private sector, reducing where possible dependence on state programmes. How the two objectives will be weighed up when they conflict is a key issue.

- 2) instruments - the statutory Renewal Area (RA) and the preparation of Neighbourhood Renewal Assessments (NRA), are the main new elements. Both the instrument and the technique recall the comprehensiveness aspired to in the PAG Report, especially the 10 year Action Area Plans. It is stated that "RAs will form an important part of many authorities' strategic plans for their districts" (Circular 6/90 p.7), and the procedure for drawing up the NRA is reminiscent of techniques of plan-making advocated in the early 1970s. It is possible then that, more than HAAs or GIAs (at least in most authorities), the new system could be used as a corporate local plan making procedure; the greater size recommended (up to 3000 houses) would support easier linking to local planning.
- 3) processes - there is a strong emphasis on involvement of local interests, but this is matched by retaining the decision making procedure within councils, and by the insistence on the search for private sector involvement too. This leaves a rather wide band of possibilities as to how planning process might be affected. Certainly there is no encouragement for radical ideas of local community control or strong municipal decentralisation; the participation of major private financial agencies would tend to operate against such processes, in most inner residential contexts.
- 4) links to implementation - this encapsulates the issue of how this primarily housing renewal system might be linked to local planning in this context. On the one hand it appears to give encouragement to more comprehensive planning for each area and therefore by linking departments and agencies would support more effective links of plans to implementation. On the other hand the commitment to private funding could create greater uncertainties in many inner areas, if returns to investors are unsure, and so make implementation even harder.

How far the new system becomes the basis for a better process of inner area local planning therefore depends very much on associated circumstances and policies, and especially on the nature of the neighbourhoods which are being tackled. The operation of each of the factors examined in this study will influence the outcome. One could enumerate a number of circumstances of particular cities and neighbourhoods (programme resources, economic, political and organisational conditions, community organisation and physical/spatial characteristics) which would favour more responsive or less responsive local planning, as a product of the new system. Without doubt though a core ingredient will be the level of public funding and how far this presses councils on to dependence on private finance. The issue therefore remains open, and there is still scope for considering the ingredients for better local planning on a more general basis.

### **E      Some Ingredients for More Responsive Local Planning**

Two simple messages of this study have been the multiplicity of factors which impinge on the creation and progression of local planning processes, and the significance, on occasions and to a degree, of very local circumstances for local planning. These entail two equally simple conclusions relevant for prescription: that a broad range of factors have to be considered in designing suitable approaches, and that a beneficial approach may well have to be quite specific to the particular area, issue or moment concerned. For the typical professional planner these are extremely demanding requirements, and one would have to accept that often the circumstances of normal employment would make their realisation impossible. At best one may expect that occasionally circumstances would encourage 'reflective practice', perhaps because of some sort of crisis or internal dispute, and lead to the invention of appropriate new forms, which would then be copied or adapted via the professional grapevine. The suggestions that follow are intended to feed into this process, in full awareness that any set of 'ingredients' would need to be changed and developed in any concrete case.

The study context has been seen to have the following characteristics:-

- (i) an often weakly organised 'local civil society', stemming from difficulties

based in the class, gender and race characteristics of these older, inner residential areas, and leading to often weak pursuit of local interests;

- (ii) piecemeal physical change spread over periods of many years, due to resource decline in both private and public sectors, setting up complex externality effects often with no straightforward resolution;
- (iii) weak private development pressure, except for occasional bursts, primarily from the retail industry;
- (iv) historically, the domination of programmes of public intervention, though with an uneven rhythm and a tendency to decline in the 1980s.

It is not possible to predict how these characteristics will change in the 1990s. It is most reasonable to assume that unless changes of policy are set in motion, they will continue in something like the same form. To respond to this situation the following conditions for more responsive local planning are proposed, along each of the four dimensions.

1) Objectives/Content

The first requirement is that there are adequate goals and programmes to achieve improvements in such areas - otherwise it is clear that even the best instruments and processes will have little point. This means the securing of an adequate set of 'structural' mechanisms 'above' these areas; this says no more than was recommended, in varying forms, by many of the Community Development Projects and by the Inner Area Studies in the late 1970s. It means normally the continuing availability of publicly funded programmes, to carry out the improvements which the commercial sector will not undertake. At the same time it means protection, through regulation and by public purchase, from any harmful effects of private commercial activity - in the case study areas this was not normally a problem but in other areas it is always a present possibility. These measures represent a structuring of the mechanisms of provision of each environmental element - whether roads, houses, shops or community buildings - without which local planning and

implementation in these contexts is likely to operate against the interests of residents.

2) Instruments

The design of the available planning instruments is adequate; as was noted in Chapter 2, most writers have considered that the statutory plan had become generally redundant in inner areas because of associated circumstances, not because of its statutory definition. In any case where statutory local plans are not practical, it will generally be quite appropriate to develop non-statutory local plans. In addition the new system of Renewal Areas and Neighbourhood Renewal Assessments could be developed as a local planning instrument, including the various safeguards of public involvement that are present in the statutory plan system (or, normally more than these).

Furthermore there will certainly be some circumstances where, for smaller or greater areas or for significant numbers of years, it is not appropriate to prepare any area frameworks of the kind indicated in the above instruments.

The case studies, and experience from Birmingham, suggest that the use of area frameworks could help on occasions to give opportunities for public involvement and the grasping of spatial interrelations at neighbourhood level. However these experiences also suggested the very great difficulty of any such attempts to freeze decisions at one moment, even spread over 1-2 years - hence the avoidance of statutory plans (except where policies not sites dominated as in Newham), the tendency to revision of frameworks and, most normally, ad hoc treatment of each site or issue. Only local circumstances could suggest whether the advantages of using local plans for participatory and spatial-interrelating purposes might outweigh the major problems involved in producing them. At least devolved administration and continuous community development would tend to facilitate regular revision, if the option of informal plans were chosen. The kind of 'information planning' adopted in Manchester's ward statements of 1985-86 and Birmingham's Inner Area Studies (especially the 1986-87 vintage) would



have a role in supporting the possibilities of public involvement.

3) Processes

On the basis of the case studies and the experiences described briefly in Birmingham and Newham, it is not easy to be certain as to how local planning process is best designed. Extensive community involvement and devolved municipal administration does not necessarily lead to better outcomes for local interests. A somewhat different process, a more electorally based, centralised 'Labourism', delivered significant gains in Gorton North, and in the other areas at certain times. Experience of decentralisation and community development in the last two decades has been far from uniformly positive - although it can always of course be claimed that the climate has often been a hard one for such initiatives. These considerations suggest to the author that a safe course is to retain the main responsibility within an elected local authority to ensure continuation of the accountability through councillors currently existing in this context (unlike in for example the Urban Development Areas). However devolution of administrative roles at the very least to the extent of the Birmingham Urban Renewal Teams and probably much nearer the Islington model would increase responsiveness of officials to local circumstances, so that each council unit dealt with an area no larger than say Harehills or Moss Side, without major departmental barriers. (In Islington there are now 24 Neighbourhood offices, administering most council services; planning is only partly decentralised, but closely connected to Neighbourhood office systems). Whether political devolution would necessarily be desirable cannot be concluded from this study - the research currently being carried out by the School of Advanced Urban Studies, Bristol, comparing decentralisation in Islington and Tower Hamlets, will help to decide whether a balance can be established which can favour community interests as well as Neighbourhood councillors and officials, and retain enough control at council-wide level to hold some of the necessary levers for the broader structuring of provision. The Tower Hamlets experience may suggest that such a balance is hard to find and that the solidity of local authority existence is undermined by full political decentralisation to an extent that reduces possibilities of effective local governance.

Administrative devolution could facilitate the more or less continuous local planning needed in these areas, by making officials as much territorially as professionally or departmentally oriented. But this would need strong support from a range of community development initiatives (community work, local group and agency funding, equal opportunities programmes etc) in order to make a more positively discriminating and deeper form of local planning possible - of the type attempted with partial success in Newham. The specific techniques needed by planners within these initiatives have been discussed in detail in various forms - for work with black/ethnic minorities by Allanah (1989) for example, to facilitate women's involvement by GLC (1986). All this would need much more publicly funded time devoted to local planning at least in those neighbourhoods where the issues arising from the interaction of the local inheritance with financing possibilities meant that outcomes mattered enough to local interests and could be controlled by local planning processes. This might only apply in a few areas of any one authority at any one time. Thus the extra input of staff over the normal devolved workload and community development presence would not be so large; this partially matches the approach in recent projects for modern estates such as Hulme (Manchester) and Canning Town (Newham).

#### 4) Links to Implementation

The changes needed to secure these links are very much connected to those needed in the content and processes of local planning proposed above. The integration of effective public (state) resourcing and extensive public (community) commitment are necessary to permit planning to secure beneficial outcomes. Potentially an instrument such as the Renewal Area could facilitate such effective implementation.

None of these proposals would make this context an easy one for local planning, especially of a form responsive to the interests often excluded in the past. The experience of Croft and Beresford (1988), that even with major community development efforts many weaker interests will be only weakly or sporadically expressed, cautions against excessive hopes. It is a reminder too of the need for

strong structural supports and for retaining considerable emphasis on electoral forms - hence the importance of experiments in changes in such forms in cases like Tower Hamlets. The characteristics of volatility, informal planning and political stress will probably remain dominant, given the likely ideological and social significance of the inner city areas in England in the 1990s. The very multiplicity observed in the creation of local planning approaches suggest that 'best practice' forms will only emerge occasionally, often helped by considerable ingenuity and pressure from planners. Variation would be considerable, even given the achievement of the measures suggested in the dimensions above.

In Chapter 1 the conditions were noted which would be necessary for local planning in this context to become of evident professional interest again. These included more support for public intervention, more concern for older residential areas (as against modern estates) and perhaps greater social and ethnic divisions. At the time of writing the only sign of movement is in the second, with the new housing renewal system; generally professional concerns have not returned to the focus of so much debate in the 1970s. If and when they do return, it will at least be possible to continue the discussions from a broader base of analysed experience. Here some of the ingredients for planning responsive to weaker social interests have been presented, entailing a structurally supported, spatially self-conscious, more or less continuous, community development based approach to inner area local planning.

## FOOTNOTES

1. This account draws on the author's work experience of Birmingham, as well as on Healey et al (1988), Gibson and Langstaff (1982), Urwin and Wenban Smith (1983) and Paris and Blackaby (1979).
2. This section is based on interviews with two planners involved, Lois Bowser and Terry Telles, in 1986, the article by Best and Bowser (1986), discussion in 1989 with the Group Leader, Ian Sim, responsible afterwards for the Plan, and examination of the following council documents:-

What is the Central Newham Local Plan?	October 1984
Summary Sheets of the Social Audit	December 1985
Draft Local Plan	March 1986
Adopted Local Plan	January 1989

Figure 17

## DIMENSIONS OF LOCAL PLANNING IN INNER OLDER RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF MAJOR ENGLISH CITIES

Area	Objectives	Content - Measures	Instruments - Plan and Programme Mechanisms	Processes - Institutional Mechanisms	Processes- Interests Involvement	Implementation
General Pattern - some significant divergences from this pattern are given for the four major cities shown below.	Electoral pressure and ideological commitment, in either permanent Labour councils or councils with Labour-Liberal or Labour-Conservative competition.	More or less extensive environmental and housing improvement programmes, with social and community facilities provision.	Statutory plans hardly used. Mainly informal planning frameworks linked to varying degrees to main line (especially housing) and supplementary (especially inner area) programmes. Mainly intra-municipal networks, but linked also to quangos, central government bodies etc.	Sometimes locally based municipal project teams, but more normally primarily departmental and working through central officers groups.	Sometimes extensive involvement of locally based interests, via associations etc, often consultation with interests less area based and connected to 'voluntary sector' aid programmes. Strong commitment to consultation with residents and other local interests.	Normally very long lead times to implementation, often 5-10 years. Difficult linking of local frameworks to implementation.
Birmingham	Labour-Conservative competition maintained commitment to older inner areas with major private sector presence.	Very extensive programmes continued on most issues into mid-1980s.	Informal plans for renewal areas supplemented by programme (especially Partnership) mechanisms linking to central government and other agencies.	Locally based renewal teams linked departments in areas, mixed in with central officers' groups.	Strong commitment to consultation with residents and other local interests.	Very long timescales, related to ambitious nature of programmes.
Leeds	Labour-Liberal-Conservative competition kept older	From early 1980s resource shift to more public sector	Mainly led first by housing renewal programme, then	Centralised departments operating mainly by informal	Varying contact with local interests, depending on period	Renewal process extremely gradual, with long hangover of

	inner areas in forefront until early 1980s.	residential areas and priorities; prior to that still a major commitment to redevelopment of older inner areas.	linked to inner area programme, both centrally managed, though some use of local area frameworks, especially 1978-82.	networking and officers groups.	and issues at stake.	programmes from 1960s or early 1970s.
Liverpool	Liberal-Labour competition created flux and uncertainty in commitment, though with major programmes until early 1980s.	Major land and environmental programmes until early 1980s, then switch to public housing areas.	Mainly led by sectoral programmes, though linked by Partnership and central government initiatives, little use of area oriented frameworks, none of statutory plans.	Primarily centrally led by inter-departmental and agency networks and groups.	Public participation organised for specific purposes and projects, rather than continually or extensively, from mid 1970s.	In older areas slow progress on most issues.
Manchester	Labour control meant somewhat lower commitment to rehabilitation of older areas, than to redevelopment schemes or modern public estates.	Major housing and environmental programmes for older areas envisaged in mid-1970s not fully progressed, though continued investment in social and community facilities.	Organised primarily by sectoral programmes, though Partnership in echans introduced certain linking processes. Little use of local plans, formal or informal, after early 1970s.	Local housing teams weakly linked to planning and other central departments, though various local committees and agencies provided degree of area - coordination in some areas.	Extensive consultation for specific issues, rather than continual process, though fuller involvement secured in a few areas.	Very little implementation between areas, but overall very gradual and hesitant progress in these areas.

Sources Working experience (Birmingham), detailed research (Leeds and Manchester - see Chapters 4 and 5), interviews 1986 (Liverpool) and published sources referred to in text

**Figure 18****THE USE OF CHANNELS OF LOCAL INFLUENCE**

<b>Type of Channels</b>	<b>Cases Encountered</b>	<b>Degree of Local Influence</b>	<b>Helpful Contextual Factors</b>	<b>Unhelpful Contextual Factors</b>
<b>HAA or GIA Scheme Preparation Process</b>	Ashton Rd site Hare-hills	Some success	Local councillor involvement IAP resources IAP resources	Difficulty of site
	Some infill sites in Moss Side cases	Several projects achieved		Relative weakness of local renewal team's position Project far advanced Project virtually decided
<b>One off officially initiated public meetings</b>	Gorton District Centre Royal Brewery	Very slight Quite limited Expansion Marginal	---- ----	Programmes mainly centrally decided
	Hyde Road Sites		----	
<b>Extensive public design exercises</b>	Gore Brook Valley	Slight	Councillor + schools involvement locally	Professionals with clear design ideas
	Walmer St Site Quinney Crescent Exercise	Very slight Slight	Sympathetic officials Planners sympathetic	No funding at that stage Other Council departments & priorities worked against it
<b>Locally initiated pressure/campaigns</b>	Bansteads Park	Significant	Local councillors & most officials sympathetic, IAP funds available	----
	'Dodge City' Site	Some effect	Councillors & officials sympathetic	----
	St Augustine's Site	Some effect	Electoral influence on councillors	Conflicts within community
	Cross Green route	Significant	Some officials & councillors sympathetic (& public inquiry process)	Remoteness of county & DOT
	Rank Optics	Some effect	Officials & Councillors sympathetic	----
	Princess Road Scheme	Some effect	Many officials & councillors sympathetic	----
	Royal Brewery Expansion	Slight	Council owned land	Large private investment attractive
<b>Riots</b>	Present as background factor in Harehills & Moss Side	Significant	----	----
<b>Local working groups</b>	Infill sites in case of Moss Side	Some effect	Involvement of local councillors & key officials, & IAP funding	Uneven linking to departmental implementers

Consultative Committees	Moss Side cases, especially Precinct & Royal Brewery	Some effect	Official character linked to council	Only consultative not finally decisive
Public Inquiries	Cross Green Route	Significant	Public control of road building, some sympathetic officials & councillors	Complexity of decision making & analytical process
Everyday ad hoc contact with council officials or with councillors	Some involvement in most cases	Cannot generalise across all cases, but quite often significant	---	---
Voting	Some effect in most cases	Especially influential in cases in Richmond Hill, politically most marginal		

#### Sources

Case studies in Chapters 5 and 6.



## REFERENCES

- Adcock B, 1979, The Effectiveness of Local Plans in the Inner Urban Areas (PTRC London)
- Allen J, 1986, Smoke over the winter palace (Paper to Second International Conference on 'Planning Theory in Practice' Turin)
- Badcock B, 1984, Unfairly structured cities (Basil Blackwell Oxford)
- Ball M, 1983, Housing policy and economic power: the political economy of owner occupation (London, Methuen)
- Ball M, 1986A, 'Housing analysis: time for a theoretical refocus?' Housing Studies Volume 1 No 3
- Ball M, 1986B 'The built environment and the urban question' Environment and Planning D Volume 4 p 447-464
- Banion M and Stubbs C, 1986, 'Rethinking the terms of tenure' Capital and Class 29 Winter 1986
- Bassett K, 1986, 'Economic restructuring, spatial coalitions and local economic development strategies' Political Geography Quarterly Supplement to Volume 5 No 4
- Batley R, 1972, 'An explanation of non-participation in planning' Policy and Politics Vol 1 No 1
- Bell C, Newby H, 1976, 'Community, Communion, Class and Community Action: the social sources of the New Urban Politics' in Social Areas in Cities Vol 2 ed Herbert D T, Johnston R J (J Wiley and Sons)
- Bentley G, Marshall M, Mawson J, Miller D, 1984, Local Economic Initiatives Study: Manchester City Council (CURS Birmingham)
- Ben-Tovim G, Gabriel J, Law I, Stredder K, 1986, The Local Politics of Race (Macmillan, London)
- Best J, Bowser L, 1986, 'A People's Plan for Central Newham', The Planner November 1986
- Bhaskar R, 1986, Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation (Verso, London)
- Bowen E and Yates S, 1974, 'Comments' The Planner Vol 60 No 1
- Brindley T, Rydin Y, Stoker G, 1989, Remaking Planning (Unwin Hyman, London)
- Brownill S, 1988, 'The People's Plan for the Royal Docks' Planning Practice and Research No 4

- Bruton M and Nicholson D, 1987, Local Planning in Practice (Hutchinson, London)
- Campaign for Homes in Central London, 1987, Community Areas Policy (CHICL, London)
- Christensen T, 1979, Neighbourhood Survival (Prism, Dorchester)
- Coates K and Silburn R, 1970, Poverty: the forgotten Englishmen (Penguin, Harmondsworth)
- Cochrane A, 1986, 'Community politics and democracy' in New Forms of Democracy ed Held D, Pollitt C, (Sage, London)
- Cockburn C, 1977, The Local State (Pluto, London)
- Croft S, Beresford P, 'A third approach to city regeneration?' Town and Country Planning March 1988
- Cummins B, 1985, The Character and Nature of the Urban Programme in Leeds (Dissertation, Leeds Polytechnic)
- Darke R, 1988, 'Democracy and Popular Planning' Paper presented to 'Radical Planning Initiatives' Conference, Polytechnic of Central London, January 1988
- Davies J G, 1972, The Evangelistic Bureaucrat (Tavistock, London)
- Dennis N, 1970, People and Planning (Faber, London)
- Dennis N, 1972, Public Participation and Planner's Blight (Faber and Faber, London)
- Department of Environment, 1975, Circular 13/75 (Housing Act 1974: Renewal Strategies) (Department of Environment London)
- Department of Environment, 1977, Inner Area Studies: Summaries of Consultants Final Reports (HMSO London)
- Department of Environment, 1978, Form and Content of Local Plans (Local Plans Note LP1/78) (Department of Environment London)
- Department of Environment, 1984, Circular 22/84 (Memorandum on Structure and Local Plans) (Department of Environment London)
- Department of Environment, 1990, Circular 6/90 (Area Renewal, Unfitness, Slum Clearance and Enforcement Action) (Department of Environment London)
- Duerden B, 1982, 'Local Planning in Liverpool' in Approaches to Local Planning ed Fudge C (SAUS, Bristol)
- Duncan S S, Goodwin M, 1985, 'Local state and local economic policy' Capital and Class Vol 27
- Duncan S S, Goodwin M, 1988, The Local State and Uneven Development (Polity Press, Cambridge)

- Dunleavy P, 1986, 'The growth of sectoral cleavages and the stabilisation of state expenditures', Society and Space Vol 4 No 2
- Dunleavy P, O'Leary B, 1987, Theories of the State (Macmillan, Basingstoke)
- English J, Madigan R, Norman P, 1976, Slum Clearance (Croom Helm, London)
- Eyles J, 1985, Senses of Place (Silverbrook Press, Warrington)
- Farnell R, 1983, Local Planning in Four English Cities (Gower, Aldershot)
- Ferris J, 1972, Participation in Urban Planning: the Barnsbury case (Bell, London)
- Fitzpatrick C et al, Housing in the community, (Leeds Polytechnic BA Thesis)
- Foord J, McDowell L, Bowlby S, 1986, For 'love' not money: gender relations in local areas (CURDS Discussion Paper No 76 Newcastle)
- Frankel B, 1983, Beyond the State? (Macmillan, London)
- Frankel B, 1986, The Post Industrial Utopians (Polity, Cambridge)
- Fraser D ed, 1980, A History of Modern Leeds (Manchester University Press)
- Fudge C, 1976, 'Local Plans, structure plans and policy planning', The Planner September 1976
- Fudge C, Lambert C, Underwood J, Healey P, 1983, Speed, Economy and Effectiveness in Local Plan Preparation and Adoption (Occasional Paper No 11 SAUS Bristol)
- Gibson M S, Langstaff M J, 1982, An Introduction to Urban Renewal (Hutchinson, London)
- Giddens A, 1979, Central problems in social theory (Macmillan, London)
- Gordon G, 1986, Regional Cities in the UK (Harper and Row, London)
- Goring A, Revill G, 1987, 'Making Links - Planning with the community' The Planner February 1987
- Greater London Council, 1986, Changing Places (GLC, London)
- Green G, 1974, 'Politics, local government and the community' Local Government Studies No 8
- Gyford J, 1985, The Politics of Local Socialism (Allen and Unwin, London)
- Gyford J, 1986, 'Diversity, Sectionalism and Local Democracy' in Widdicombe Inquiry Research Appendices Volume 4 (HMSO)

- Hajer M, 1988, City Politics (Gower, Aldershot)
- Hall P et al, 1973, The Containment of Urban England (Allen & Unwin, London)
- Ham C, and Hill M, 1984, The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State (Wheatsheaf, Brighton)
- Hambleton R, 1976, 'Local Planning and Area Management' The Planner September 1976
- Harvey D, 1971, 'Social processes, spatial form and the redistribution of real income in an urban system' in M Chisholm ed. Regional Forecasting (Butterworth, London)
- Harvey D, 1987 'Three myths in search of a reality in urban studies', Society and Space Vol 5 No 4
- Harvey D, 1989, The Urban Experience (Blackwell, Oxford)
- Hayes M, 1981, 'Local Planning and the inner city: the Liverpool case' (PTRC London)
- Healey P, 1983, Local Plans in British Land Use Planning (Pergamon, Oxford)
- Healey P, 1984, 'Local Planning in Manchester' in Local Planning in Practice, Fudge C, Healey P, (SAUS Bristol)
- Healey P, Doak A, McNamara P, Elson M 1985, The Implementation of Planning Policies and the Role of Development Plans (Department of Town Planning, Oxford Polytechnic)
- Healey P, McNamara P, Elson M, Doak A, 1988, Land Use Planning in Britain (Cambridge University Press)
- Hindess B, 1971, The Decline of Working Class Politics (MacGibbon and Kee)
- Jacobs B, 1986, Black politics and urban crisis in Britain (Cambridge University Press)
- Keat R, and Urry J, 1982, Social Theory as Science (RKP, London)
- Kemeny J, 1987, 'Towards a theorised housing studies: a counter-critique of the provision thesis' Housing Studies Vol 2 No 4
- Lambert C, Underwood J, 1984, Local Planning in Manchester (Mimeo)
- Lambert J, Paris C, Blackaby B, 1978, Housing Policy and the State (Macmillan, London)
- Lawless P, 1989, Britain's Inner Cities (Chapman, London)

- Layder D, 1985, 'Beyond Empiricism? The Promise of Realism' Philosophy of the Social Sciences Vol 15 No 3
- Leeds Churches Community Involvement Project, 1986, Faith in Leeds
- Little J, Peake L and Richardson P, 1988, Women in Cities (Macmillan, London)
- Lowe S, 1986, Urban Social Movements (Macmillan, London)
- McNamara P, 1984, Implementation of Development Plans: the Experience of Inner Manchester (Mimeo)
- Manchester City Council, 1986, Poverty in Manchester
- Mason T, 1977, Inner City Housing and Urban Renewal Policy: a Housing Profile of Cheetham Hill Manchester and Salford (CES, London)
- Massey D, 1984, Spatial Divisions of Labour (Macmillan, London)\_
- Massey D, Meegan R, ed, 1985, Politics and Method (Methuen, London)
- Mawson J, Miller D, Roberts D, 1984, Local Economic Initiatives Study: Leeds City Council (CURS, University of Birmingham)
- Mayo M ed, 1977, Women in the community (RKP, London)
- Medhurst D, Parry Lewis J, 1969, Urban Decay (Macmillan, London)
- Moore R, 1975, 'Gradual Renewal' Architects Journal 5 Feb 1975
- Morphet J, 1986A, 'Some thoughts on Local Plans as interventionist tools', Paper presented at Seminar on 'Research in Development Planning', SAUS Bristol June 1986
- Morphet J, 1986B, 'Alternative funding for alternative practice', paper presented to Second International Conference on 'Planning Theory in Practice', Turin
- Morphet J 1987, 'Local Authority decentralisation - Tower Hamlets goes all the way', Policy and Politics Vol 15 No 2
- Muchnick D, 1970, Urban Renewal in Liverpool (Bell, London)
- Newman P, 1987, 'Public Action Zones', Paper presented to seminar on 'Town Planning and the Changing City', Leeds Polytechnic June 1987
- Nicholson J, 1974, 'The Disintegration of a Housing Action Group in Manchester' in Community Work Case Studies ed G Craig (ACW, Newcastle)
- Ollman B, 1971, Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

- Outhwaite W, 1987, New philosophies of social science (Macmillan, London)
- Pahl R E, 1984, Divisions of Labour (Basil Blackwell, Oxford)
- Paris C, Blackaby B, 1979, Not Much Improvement (Heinemann, London)
- Parry G, Moyser G, Wagstaffe M, 1987, 'The crowd and the community: context, content and aftermath' in The Crowd in Contemporary Britain ed Gaskell G, Benewick R, (Sage, London)
- Perrigo S, 1986, 'Socialist feminism and the Labour Party: Some experiences from Leeds' Feminist Review No 23
- Perry J, 1974, 'Approaches to local planning' The Planner Vol 60 No 1
- Perry J, 1976, 'Innovations in local planning' The Planner Vol 62 No 4
- Pickvance C G, 1985, 'Spatial policy as territorial politics: the role of spatial coalitions in the articulation of "spatial" interests and in the demand for spatial policy' in G Rees et al eds Political Action and Social Identity (Macmillan, London)
- Rex J and Moore R, 1967, Race, Community and Conflict (Oxford University Press)
- Robson B, 1988, Those Inner Cities (Clarendon, Oxford)
- Rydin Y, 1986, 'Urban planning in the 1980s', Paper presented at seminar on 'Research in Development Planning' SAUS Bristol June 1986
- Sarre P, 1986, 'Choice and constraint in ethnic minority housing' Housing Studies Vol 1 No 2
- Saunders P, 1986, Social Theory and the Urban Question (Second edition, Hutchinson, London)
- Sayer A, 1984, Explanation in Social Science: a Realist approach (Hutchinson, London)
- Schon D, 1983, The Reflective Practitioner (Temple Smith, London)
- Shelter Neighbourhood Action Project, 1972, Another chance for cities (Chalter, London)
- Shelton T, Jones G, Titterington D, 1979, 'Five years of local plans - the Leeds experience' The Planner July 1979
- Shelton T, 1985, 'Things out in the open: Notes from Leeds' The Planner December 1985
- Shotter J, 1989, 'Notes on Social Constructionism', Paper presented to conference on 'Realism and the Human Sciences', Manchester Polytechnic September 1989

- Southern L, Noble T, 1982, 'The Corporate Approach to Local Planning' The Planner September 1982
- Stevens V, 1985, The Labour Party in Manchester 1978-84 (BA Thesis Manchester Polytechnic)
- Stoker G T, 1985, The Politics of Urban Renewal in Withington Village Manchester 1962-83 (Thesis, University of Manchester)
- Stoker G T, 1988, The Politics of Local Government (Macmillan, Basingstoke)
- Sutcliffe A, Smith R, 1974, Birmingham 1939-70 (Oxford University Press)
- Thompson R, 1977, 'Camden's local plan: a district wide approach' The Planner Vol 63 No 5
- Thornley A, 1977, Theoretical Perspectives on Planning Participation (Pergamon, Oxford)
- Tommlinson M, 1989, 'Tower Hamlets: The Story So Far' Going Local
- Thrift N, 1987, 'No perfect symmetry' Society and Space Vol 5 No 4
- Town and Country Planning Association, 1986, Whose responsibility? Reclaiming the Inner Cities (TCPA, London)
- Urry J, 1987, 'Society, space and locality', Society and Space Vol 4 No 4
- Urwin J and Wenban-Smith A, 1983, Local planning in inner Birmingham (PTRC London)
- Wainwright H, 1987, A Tale of Two Parties (Hogarth, London)
- Ward R, 1979, 'Where race didn't divide' in Racism ed R Miles, A Phizacklea (RKP, London)
- Wates N, 1976, The Battle for Tolmers Square (RKP, London)
- Wenban Smith A, 1983, 'Local plans and the inner cities', Town and Country Planning Vol 52 No7/8
- Wheale G, 1974, Citizen Participation in the redevelopment of Moss Side Manchester (M Ed Thesis University of Manchester)
- Wheale G, 1979, Citizen Participation in the rehabilitation of housing in Moss Side East Manchester (PhD Thesis, University of Manchester)
- Wiener R, 1976, The Economic Base of Leeds (WEA, Leeds)
- Wiener R, 1977, The Social Base of Leeds (WEA, Leeds)

- Williams G, 1983, Inner city policy: a partnership with the voluntary sector? (Bedford Square Press)
- Williams R, 1973, The Country and the City (Chatto and Windus, London)
- Williams R, 1981, Culture (Fontana, London)
- Willmott P, 1981, 'The social causes of inner city decline' New Universities Quarterly Vol 35 No 3
- Willmott P, 1986, Social Networks, Informal Care and Public Policy (Policy Studies Institute)
- Willmott P, 1989, Community Initiatives: patterns and prospects (PSI, London)
- Women and Geography Study Group (IBG), 1984, Geographer and gender (Hutchinson, London)
- Yin R, 1984, Case Study Research (Sage, Beverly Hills)



## APPENDIX 1

### LEEDS SOURCES

#### 1. Citywide

##### A Council Documents

1. Leeds Development Plan (Revised) 1972.
2. Leeds Housing Strategy, Report of Housing Working Party April 1975.
3. Clearance and Improvement Programmes, Report of Housing Working Party, April 1975.
4. Clearance Programme and Local Rehousing, Report of Housing Working Party, November 1975.
5. Urban Renewal Areas, Report to Planning and Development Committee, April 1985.
6. Planning Service Annual Reports 1984-87.
7. Urban Programme Submission Documents 1979-86.
8. Leeds Municipal Yearbook 1966-86.

##### B Interviews

9. Tony Shelton, Planning Department.
10. Eric Bowen, Housing Department.

##### C Other

11. Community Action No 35 Jan-Feb 1978, 'Understanding the Political Economy of Leeds'.
12. A W Brown, Approaches to Local Planning (BA Thesis Leeds Polytechnic 1982).
13. B Cummins, The Character and Nature of the Urban Programme in Leeds (Dissertation Leeds Polytechnic 1985).
14. Leeds Churches Community Involvement Project, 1986, Faith in Leeds.

#### 2. Harehills

##### A Council Documents

15. Harehills Environmental Area, March 1971.
16. Harehills/Gipton District Appraisal, March 1974.

17. The Bexleys Proposed HAA, Joint Report of Directors of Housing and Planning and Chief Environmental Health Officer June 1976.
18. The Elford/Bayswaters Proposed HAA, Report of Area Improvement Steering Group May 1977.
19. Conways Proposed GIA, Report of Area Improvement Steering Group June 1978.
20. Declared Housing Improvement Areas and Development Plan Allocations, Report to Planning and Development Committee Sept 1978.
21. Land Use Policy in the Harehills Triangle, Report to Planning and Development Committee Feb 1979.
22. Lorry Ban Inquiry, Statement of Leeds City Council March 1979.
23. Inspector's Report on A 58 Lorry Ban Public Inquiry July 1979.
24. Harehills Triangle - Position Statement, Report to Planning and Development Committee September 1980.
25. Notes of Meetings, Harehills Triangle Planning Policy November 1980.
26. Draft Reports on the Bansteads Redevelopment Area Jan/Feb 1981.
27. Planning Proposals for the Harehills Triangle April 1981.
28. Third Urban Programme Report (Harehills Priority Area).
29. East Leeds Local Plan - Press Notice Jan 1982.
30. Dodge City Site Harehills Lane, Report to Planning and Development Committee Appointed Members June 1982.
31. Land Use Possibilities Rank Optics Site, Report to Planning and Development Committee July 1983.
32. Note on Lambtons/Lascelles, Housing Department 1985.
33. Four Years One, The Leeds Experience, Note on Harehills and Chapeltown, Dec 1985.
34. Harehills URA - Appendix to Report on URAs to Housing Committee 1985.
35. URA - Action Statement on Harehills, Report to Urban Renewal Sub-Committee March 1986.
36. Lambtons/Lascelles - Social Survey Report, Urban Renewal Sub-Committee March 1986.
37. Weekly Shopping Facilities in Inner East Leeds, Report to Planning and Development Committee April 1986.

38. Revised Shopping Frontages and Centres East Leeds, West Leeds and Otley, Report to Planning and Development Committee July 1986.
39. Note on Rank Optics Site, Planning Department 1986.

#### Planning Department Files

40. 11A/1 Harehills District Centre 1966-74.
41. 11 Greater Harehills 1966-74
42. 11A Harehills 1965-76.
43. 12D Rank Optics 1981-86.
44. 6E East Leeds Shopping 1984-86.
45. 12B Harehills General 1983-86.
46. 29F St James Hospital 1983-86.
47. Top 03 Site Selection.
48. 29E Hill St (Lincoln Rd) Clearance Area.
- 48A P208 Lorry Ban File.
- 48B. Development control File on 'Dodge City' Harehills Lane

#### Housing Department Files

49. Bexleys HAA, 1976-86.
50. Conways GLA, 1978-86.
51. Harehills URA, 1985-86.
52. Elford's HAA, 1977-86.
- 53/56. Clearance Files - Rosevilles (1 and 2), Bayswater (No 1) and (No 2) and Banstead Grove.

#### B Interviews

57. Richard Wixey, Housing Department.
58. Lorraine Schofield, Housing Department.
59. Russell Ward, Housing Department.
60. Harry Blackwell, Housing Department
61. Michael Simmons, Harehills councillor.
62. Ken Gillespie, Planning Department.
63. Phil Barnes, Planning Department.
64. Alan Jesson, Education Department.

- 65. Ian Mackenzie, Education Department.
- 66. Juliet Peirce, Harehills Action Group.
- 67. Ghulam Hussain, Harehills Action Group.
- 68. David Luck, Urban Development Unit, Chief Executive's Department.
- 68A. John Secombe, Planning Department.

C      Other

- 69. Fitzpatrick C et al, Housing in the Community, Leeds Polytechnic BA Thesis 1975.
- 70. Annual Report 1980 of Harehills Community Liaison Group November 1980.
- 71. Keep it Under Your Hat, A Report on Harehills 1984.
- 72. Evening Post 27/3/74, 24/1/76, 29/6/78. 24/7/79. 11/2/82. 28/2/83.
- 73. Leeds Other Paper Issues 1-100 (1973-79).

3.      **Richmond Hill**

A      Council Documents

- 74. Shopping provision correspondence Dec 1972.
- 75. Local Centre correspondence April 1973.
- 76. Victoria First School Planning correspondence Feb-Aug 1973.
- 77. Richmond Hill Area Redevelopment Progress Notes Jan 1974.
- 78. Berthas (Upper Accommodation Road) Joint Report of Housing Working Party 1975.
- 79. Raincliffes Proposed HAA - Report of Area Improvement Steering Group Jan 1978.
- 80. Meeting on Highways Proposals and Future Local Planning Work Feb 1978.
- 81. Richmond Hill Local Planning Exercise Brief August 1978.
- 82. Ellerby Lane Housing Programme Site Planning Brief 1978.
- 83. Richmond Hill Appraisal - Report to Planning and Development Committee Feb 1979.
- 84. Proposals for Richmond Hill, Information Note April 1979.
- 85. Urban Programme 1979 Submission Meeting, Social Projects April 1979.
- 86. Urban Programme 1979 Submission Meeting, Social Projects May 1979.
- 87. Notes of Meeting of Inner City Sub-Committee of Richmond Hill Advisory Group May 1979.

88. Second Urban Programme Report September 1979.
89. Richmond Hill Appraisal - Progress Report June 1980.
90. Richmond Hill Local Centre Redevelopment Planning Brief, Report to Planning and Development Committee June 1981.
91. Richmond Hill Ward Planning Profile June 1982.
92. Briefing Note to Councillors Park, Kilgallon and Walker July 1984 (Response to Cross Green Report).
93. East End Park Urban Renewal Area (Appendix 9 to URAs report to Housing Committee 1985).

#### Planning Department Files

94. 14C Compilation file of earlier Richmond Hill material 1964-80.
95. A32e-12 Richmond Hill South 1966-80.
96. A32e-11 Richmond Hill North 1966-80.
97. 25/A Richmond Hill General 1980-85.
98. D13 Richmond Hill General 1978-81.
99. 25D Richmond Hill Local Centre 1972-86.

#### Housing Department Files

- 100-105. Clearance Area Files - Long Close Lane, Dial St, East Park Mount, Berthas, Elsie, Glencoes/Pretorias.
106. Richmond Hill Urban Renewal Area General File.
107. Raincliffes HAA File.

#### B Interviews

108. Sue Loewenstein, Cross Green.
109. Doreen Hamilton, Richmond Hill councillor.
110. Briony House, community worker.
111. Ken Gillespie, City Planning Department.
112. John Smith, City Planning Department.

#### C Other

113. Yorkshire Evening Post 15/10/73, 31/1/74, 10/11/76, 24/11/77, 13/11/80, 12/3/81, 19/5/83.

114. Cross Green : Housing-in-Action? Report by Cross Green Community Association June 1984.

## APPENDIX 2

### MANCHESTER SOURCES

#### 1. Citywide

##### A Council Documents

1. General Improvement Areas, Report to Policy Committee Sept 1970.
2. City of Manchester Census Information (1971).
3. Housing and Urban Renewal in Manchester, City Planning Department 1971.
4. Housing Action Areas, Note for Discussion, Draft Report August 1973.
5. Housing Improvement Programme, Proposals for the first two years November 1974.
6. Manchester and Salford Inner Area Study Subject Papers 1-10 Oct 1978 (Manchester and Salford Inner Area Partnership Research Group).
7. Area Improvement Strategy, Report of Director of Housing 1980.
8. Council Committee and Working Party Organisation March 1980.
9. Annual Report to Household Needs and Resources Committee 1980/81.
10. Outline Planning Strategy for the Inner City June 1981.
11. Partnership in Practice, The Experience of Inner Manchester December 1982.
12. Area Information, Report to committees December 1982.
13. Review of Inner City Strategy, Report to Policy Committee April 1983.
14. East Manchester Planning Framework January 1983 Planning Department.
15. City of Manchester Census Atlas (1981 Census) 1983.
16. Road Proposals and Blight, County Planning Dept. 1984.
17. List of HAAs and GIAs, 1984, Environmental Health Department.
18. Community Landscapes Pack 1985 Planning Department.
19. Inner Area Land Use Map 1985 Planning Department.
20. 1985 Population Survey Planning Department.
21. Community Technical Aid Centre Annual Report 1985/6.
22. Manchester City Council Yearbook 1966-84.
23. Annual Reports of Environmental Health Department 1975-85.
- 23A. City of Manchester Development Plan (1961)
- 23B. Poverty in Manchester (1986).

**B      Interviews**

- 24. Ted Kitchen, Assistant City Planning Officer, Manchester City Council.
- 24A. Roger Hamilton, Manchester Council for Voluntary Service.

**C      Other**

- 25. E. Burney, Housing on Trial Chapter 6, Manchester: Problems at the core.
- 26. R. Edmonds, Manchester: A colossus of the North, Housing Rev Jan-Feb 1979.
- 27. Community Action (magazine) Issues 3, 6, 7, 8, 16.
- 28. A. Roberts, The Bulldozers must come back, Labour Weekly Jan 14 1944.
- 29. A. Roberts, Paint the Town Hall red, New Manchester Review 16-29 June 1978.

**2      Gorton North**

**A      Council Documents**

**Planning Department**

- 66. Gorton/West Gorton outline planning brief 1969.
- 67. Gorton North ward, 1971 census summary tables.
- 68. Reports to committees on Gorton District Centre April 1978.
- 69. Gorton and Harpurhey District Centres - Report to Policy Committee June 1978.
- 70. Notes of Public Meeting on Gorton District Centre Sept 1978.
- 71. Development Brief for Gorton District Centre November 1978.
- 72. Gorton North Ward 1981 Census Information.
- 73. East Manchester District Centres - Potential for further shopping development (Report for Planning Committee) August 1982.
- 74. District Centre Shopping Profile (Report for Planning Committee) November 1982.
- 75. Gorton District Centre, Report to Land and Development Committee December 1982.
- 76. Gorton North Area Information 1982.
- 77. Policies and Attitudes - Gorton North and South (Local Planning Position Statement) 1983.
- 78. Gore Brook Valley Park, Report to committees December 1984.



- 79. Planning in Gorton North, ward leaflet, May 1986.
- 80. Planning in Gorton South, ward leaflet, May 1986.
- 81. Allocation of vacant sites in the vicinity of Gorton District Centre, Report to committees Nov/Dec 1986.

#### Planning Department Files

- 82. 21A Lees St/Longford Lane area 1978-86.
- 83. 21B Abbey Hey East 1978-86.
- 84. 22B Gorton Lane 1978-86.
- 85. 22C District Centre 1978-86.
- 85A. 22D Chapman St area 1978-86.
- 86. 22E Kirk St/Tan Yard Brow 1978-81.
- 87. 22I Garratt Way facilities 1982-86.

#### Housing Department

- 88. Cross Lane HAA declaration report July 1976.
- 89. Abbey Hey HAA declaration report November 1979.
- 90. Longford Lane GIA declaration report Jan 1980.

#### B Interviews

- 91. Richard Ogier, Principal Planning Officer, City Planning Department.
- 92. Joe Egan, Area Manager, Gorton, Environmental Health Department.
- 93. Colin Brierley, councillor, Gorton North ward 1973-86.
- 94. Pauline Cunningham, Secretary, Gorton Village Residents Association.
- 95. Harry Travis, Chairman, Abbey Hey and District Residents Association.

#### C Other

- 96. Manchester Evening News 22/5/78, 2/7/79, 19/2/80, 21/3/84.
- 96A. East Manchester Reporter 20/6/80 Report on Inner City Ward Meeting.

### 3 Moss Side

#### A Council Documents

##### Planning Department

97. Moss Side Wards 1971 Census summary
98. Moss Side and Rusholme Redevelopment Proposals October 1971.
99. Use of land at Walmer St/Wilmslow Rd Rusholme, Report to committees September 1980.
100. Use of land at Walmer St/Wilmslow Rd, Report to committees November 1981.
101. Moss Side Ward 1981 Census Information.
102. Shops in Princess Rd/Claremont Rd - draft of report to Moss Side Consultative Committee.
103. Moss Side Shopping Provision - Internal Memorandum April 1982.
104. Policies and Attitudes, Hulme, Moss Side and Rusholme (Local Planning Position Statement) 1983.
105. Quinney Crescent, Consultative exercise October 1983.
- 105A. Royal Brewery Expansion, Report to Planning Committee January 1984.
106. Rusholme's Vacant site, consultative exercise March 1984.
107. Changes of use in Rusholme shopping centre, report to Planning Committee August 1984.
108. Population in Moss Side, 1985 Population Survey leaflet.
109. Planning in Moss Side, ward leaflet, May 1986.
110. Allocation of land at Walmer St, Rusholme, report to committees November/December 1986.
111. What's on 87, Planning for Moss Side, leaflet for information .

##### Planning Department Files

(1978-86 unless stated)

112. 14C Barnhill St/Princess Rd.
113. 14D Broadfield Rd area 1982-86.
114. 14E Bus depot area.
115. 14F Moss Lane East
116. 14G Maine Rd area.
117. 14H Horton Rd area.

- 118. 14I Haydn/Ruskin Ave.
- 119. 14J Gt Southern St 1983-86.
- 120. 14K Wincombe St area.
- 121. 16A Parkfield St/Walmer St.
- 122. 16B Thurloe St/Rusholme centre.
- 123. 16C Hibbert St area.
- 124. 16D Victory St area.

Housing Department/Environmental Health Department

- 125-130. Files on Alison St GIA, Beresford St HAA, Haydn/Ruskin GIA, Kensington/Tyldesley HAA, Greame St HAA, Wheeldon St HAA.
- 131. Moss Side Inner City Ward Committee News Sheets November 1982 (No.1) July 1985.
- 132. Proposals for public meeting of ward committee September 1985.
- 133. Moss Side Neighbourhood Committee agendas and minutes July and November 1986.

B Interviews

- 134. Jim Metcalf, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department.
- 135. Roger Hall, Planning Officer, Planning Department.
- 136. Penny Boothman, Strategy Unit, Town Clerk's Department.
- 137. Alan Hudson, Area Manager, Moss Side, Environmental Health Department.
- 138. Sue Robertshaw, Area Coordinator Housing Department 1975-80.
- 139. Russell Talbot, councillor 1971-82, chairman Neighbourhood Consultative Committee.
- 140. Arnold Spencer, councillor 1979-86, chair Planning Committee 1984-86.
- 141. Phil Barton, Community Technical Aid Centre.
- 142. Pam Schwartz, Moss Care Housing Association.
- 143. Rick Sumner, Moss Side Family Advice Centre.
- 144. Derek Rogers, newsagent, community activist.

C Books/Articles

- 145. Moss Side Story, Gavin Weighman, New Society July 13 1978
- 146. Moss Side Family Advice Centre 1984 Report.

147. S E Kenny The Mass Media Coverage of the Moss Side Disturbances and some implications for community work (PhD Thesis, Manchester University 1985).
148. Robin Ward Residential Succession and Race Relations, Moss Side Manchester (PhD Thesis Manchester University).
149. Colin Wood, Advocacy and urban renewal, with special reference to Moss Side Manchester (MA Thesis, Manchester University 1978).
150. Karen Broadbridge, Environmental Improvements in Moss Side (MTP Thesis Manchester University 1978).
151. P D Lake, Development Issues and Planning Procedures-Specific examples from the world of professional football (MSc Dissertation Oxford Polytechnic 1981).
152. Manchester Evening News 14/9/68, 16/3/76, 8/12/77. 13/3/78, 23/3/79, 2/7/79, 27/2/80, 28/2/80.

## APPENDIX 3      Research Method

### 1.      Introduction

In considering the connection between the theorising of social research methods and actual research, some scepticism is appropriate. In the last three or four decades the social sciences have passed through periods marked by strong adherence to positivist methodologies, then a general turn against such approaches and, most recently, uncertainty and eclecticism. Although research output has been affected, with a large proportion of research the links have been weak. A researcher's preference for developing Weberian 'ideal types' or realist 'mechanisms' may well seem to make little difference to the illumination received on the topics studied. Often it seems to be the case that the broadly ideological preferences of researchers are filtered through positions taken on methodology or social science philosophies.

Given this understanding, I do not pretend to a position superior to that of many other social researchers. I am similarly affected by the links between ideological preferences and research philosophies. I am drawn more towards the set of methodological writings put together in the last 15 years or so by Marxist influenced social scientists and philosophers than to groups influenced more by Weber or other dominant theorists. However, I do not claim that this set of writings has dictated the way I have carried out this investigation. At most I will argue that they are broadly compatible with how I take the research process to have evolved.

In this appendix I will therefore first outline my own approach to the research. Then I will give a brief sketch of the kinds of guidance offered by 'realist' and related approaches, including discussion of some criticisms. Finally it will be possible to consider the degree of compatibility between the two sides, the 'theory' and 'practice'. I would note at this point that I consider that these issues are very much more unresolved than they are occasionally made to appear. Admitting to difficulties in linking research philosophies and actual research seems to be not a sign of intellectual failure, at present, but a 'realism' (in the more normal sense) of an appropriate kind.

## 2. Actual Research Approach

My understanding of how the research has progressed can be summarised as a process of more or less continuous iterative dialogue between a variety of forms of 'data' and 'theory'.

Thus at the start the 'data' were in a rather more practice related form, from years of inner city local planning experience, informed by general debates on both town planning and politics. The gradual feeding in of more theorised data from the planning and other social science literature affected the understandings already gained of local planning in the selected context.

A short period of extensive investigation was first carried out (as reported briefly in Chapter 1), in order to define the object of research more clearly and to prospect for suitable sites for more intensive studies. These studies were seen as necessary in order to gain a deeper understanding of local processes. As Yin (1984), Massey and Meegan (1984) and Sayer (1984) all emphasise in varying ways, the use of extensive and intensive research strategies depends simply on the form of research questions asked. Very often elements of both are applicable. The greater concentration in this investigation on intensive studies in two cities arose from the need to examine in detail how particular processes worked. The brief consideration of other cases (in Chapter 7) followed on the same procedure, to give extra potential variety to the understanding of local processes. The aim in these cases was not to collect in any extensive form the data of some more 'representative' population of cases. The emphasis was still on detailed process, using available secondary sources, to contrast the local planning approaches in these cases with those in the central studies.

Throughout the investigation there was a continuous reconsideration of desirable analytical frameworks for treating the range of data - whether data came from prior to the research period, from extensive personal or literature search or from intensive studies. Data was not seen as fixed and finalised, but always as potentially available for reanalysis or retheorising, in order to better respond to the research questions.

The exposition of the research results did not reflect at all directly this process of investigation. The study is presented in four stages, with extensive search (Chapter 2), analytical development (Chapter 3), intensive studies (Chapters 4, 5 and 6) and a form of cross-checking through other illuminating cases (Chapter 7). Keeping this approach in mind, the preferred research philosophies will be considered next.

### 3. Preferred Research Philosophies

'Philosophies' in the plural are referred to deliberately, as the starting point here is that there is currently, at the end of the 1980s, no single philosophy which either for me personally, or generally for social researchers, holds sway. A recent debate such as that reported in the journal "Society and Space" (December 1987) served to emphasise the very wide range of opinions on methodological and theoretical issues in geographical and urban studies, even within relatively circumscribed Marxist or other 'progressive' circles.

If one were to try to find two points of agreement from most of those in such a debate, they might be that empirical research was sorely needed and that a multiplicity of approaches might be appropriate in such research. Virtually all contributors adhered to the idea that careful theorising and conceptual development were essential.

My own view is that many aspects of realist philosophy provide support for these broad positions. Realism, as developed above all by Bhaskar (eg 1986), contains at the least emphases which encourage certain research approaches and discourage others. The central emphases are (following Outhwaite, 1987) these:

- (i) that there is a distinction between the real, the actual and the empirical, such that the first two cannot be reduced to the last - to be is not to be perceived;
- (ii) reality is stratified also in the sense that there is a basic, ontological difference between the real entities of the world and our concepts, models etc for dealing with them;

- (iii) causal relations are tendencies generated by real mechanisms; these may or may not produce events, which may or may not be observed.

In the work of Bhaskar these emphases produce a convincing account of how sciences have actually been moulded, especially the physical and biological sciences. In his writing they are further developed into a more specific social philosophy, 'critical realism', which seeks to make substantive statements about how society is. From another viewpoint Sayer (1984) tends to develop the basic ideas into a more detailed methodology for doing social research. Both of these developments may have some value, but they are not it seems directly required by the basic realist meta-theory.

Before developing further the positions which do seem to connect with the basic realist position, I will refer to another element of Bhaskar's type of realism which has some importance. This is his discussion of the relation between facts and values. In more traditional positivist accounts the separation between these domains is virtually total, with a conception that social scientists must strive at all costs to be objective and value neutral. It was sometimes accepted that values unavoidably affected research goals and strategies, but not that explanation could flow back to affect value judgements. Other philosophical positions, particularly some flowing from Hegel and Marx, have argued against this split, either totally, as in the rejection of ethics as a separate sphere of thought (see Ollman 1971 for an argument that this was Marx's position) or more partially. Sayer for example points towards a blurring of the distinction in his discussion of 'knowledge in context' (1984, Chapter 1), but does not tackle the issue directly.

Bhaskar on the other hand argues that realist ontology entails a revised view of ethics, such that values can be derived logically, sometimes, from theoretical explanations. His justification of this position is lengthy (see Bhaskar 1986 pp 169-180) and may be challengeable on logical philosophical grounds (I have seen no such challenge as yet). The essential core is that if one knows a belief to be false and one knows its source, one can proceed directly to a negative evaluation of the source and a positive evaluation of any practice removing the source (*ceteris*



paribus). I only wish here to stress that there is a serious and argued position which thoroughly weakens the fact-value distinction.

This appears to be important in any consideration of practices and the understandings and values motivating those practices. The aim is not to argue that personal preferences can be introduced at will at any point in any investigation. What is affected is the idea that actors ought always to rigidly separate 'subjective' and 'objective' spheres of operation. There appear to be at least some philosophical grounds as to why such a strict ordinance is irrational and why we must often expect a greater mutual osmosis of facts and values.

Moving on to the development of the positions from the basic realist viewpoint, I consider that the cautious approach of Outhwaite (1987) is preferable, linking realism to hermeneutics and critical theory, and thus to aspects of structurationism. This suggests the idea that there is an overall 'camp' of positions which are developing in the social sciences, reacting against the positivist positions of earlier decades.

More or less loosely tied to the realist positions stated above, this 'camp' would agree on several general understandings about social theorising. Firstly, given its view that social theory always operates in open systems which are not suitable for direct experiments and cannot yield firm predictions, it emphasises "the much lesser revelatory power of social theory" (Outhwaite 1987 p 113). Grand theory and great leaps forward will tend to be the exception and always open to challenge.

Secondly social theorists should "abandon the usual methodologists' quest for the holy grail of a single model for all purposes" (Sayer 1984 p 136). "The social sciences require a plurality of methodological approaches" (Outhwaite 1987 p 116); Outhwaite suggests for example that more holistic explanations will be appropriate in some instances, in other cases more individualistic ones will make sense (p 116). For one purpose we may lean more to Bhaskar's slightly structurally inclined "transformational model of social activity" (Bhaskar 1986 pp 122-129), for another more to Giddens's structurationist conception, which tends slightly to an agent oriented view of social process. Neither is dictated by the metatheory of realism,

any more than any other social theory conception. Sometimes it may be perfectly appropriate to adopt a highly 'structuralist' view of social change, like the capital-logic tendencies of Harvey (eg 1989 Chapter 9). Thrift (1987), in his argument for a multi-pronged attack by current social theory without 'overtotalising', with as much emphasis on the constitution of individual subjects as on political-economic structures, puts the case for variety well.

Thirdly there is plenty of space for a 'middle position' between the extremes of naive empiricism and what might be called pure abstractionism. I would agree with realism in its desire to escape from the simplicities of the sharp theory-observation distinction and the covering-law model of explanation (that there are regular and universal relations between events). But these can be replaced, respectively, by what Outhwaite calls "a complex network of relatively 'theoretical' and relatively 'observational' statements" and by "explanation as the attempt to represent the generative mechanisms which bring about the explanandum" (1987, p 58).

The 'middle position' then accepts both these facets of actual research. As Keat and Urry argue in their updated, toned down version of realist social science (1982 p 247):- "these two forms of practice, the 'empirical' and the 'conceptual' are both necessary and there is no particular order in which they should occur". They argue for a "minimal empiricism" (p 233), in which all researchers are empiricists. Some of the critiques of Bhaskar's realism have moved on the same lines, as in Shotter's 'social constructionist' modifications (Shotter 1989) (in a hermeneutic direction) and in Layder's similar stress on the importance of theoretical discourses in setting our 'social ontologies' (Layder 1985).

All are treading on the difficult ground 'between' theory and data. This terrain has to be recognised by social theory, despite its difficulty. I have suggested here that a plurality of methodological approaches can flow from the baselines of a realist metatheory and that a balance of 'empirical' and 'conceptual' is needed in any research endeavour. Before considering how far this position is compatible with or informs my own research, I will consider briefly some criticisms of realism.

Such consideration is necessary when one notes that there have been both strong assertions of and strong attacks on realism as a social theory approach. I believe that both of these are exaggerated, in that excessive claims encourage heavy counter claims. Thus Saunders (1986) has criticised the 'epistemological imperialism' (p 354) of realism, as successor to the structuralist Marxism of the 1970s, in allowing any linking between theory and data that appeals to the researcher. Harvey (1987) makes a similar argument, that if an event does not seem to be explained by a broader generative mechanism, it can be described as 'contingent' and by implication unworthy of explanation. He sees the abandonment of universal statements and abstractions, with a collapse into "a mass of contingencies exhibiting relations and processes special to each unique event" (Harvey 1987 p 373). Both writers wish to know how realists can know what is contingent, what structural.

To this question there is no simple answer just as there is no simple answer to how a Weberian identifies an ideal type or a Marxist analyses a dialectical process. The argument between Sayer and Saunders (Sayer 1984 pp 198-200, Saunders 1986 pp 356-61) is inconclusive. Sayer's arguments for considering the plausibility of the explanatory mechanism, seeking further evidence of its powers and 'triangulating' evidence seem at least useful moves towards acceptable theory gaining greater confidence in an explanation. Outhwaite (1987) too can only suggest very general guidelines for overcoming the characteristic social science situation where several competing theories seek to explain a complex and over determined object. He suggests (pp 58-59) (i) that we should not be afraid of abstraction and (ii) that given the stratification of reality we have often to look at quite wide contexts.

In summary it may be argued that the attacks on realism primarily refer to the difficulty of a large proportion of social theorising. Where realists have claimed to have very particular tools which might open up explanation more easily than the normal back and forth of theory and data, as with Bhaskar's (and Sayer's) 'retroduction' (see Bhaskar 1986 p 68), they have gone too far and invited criticism. Given an acceptance of the stratification of reality and a plurality of research approaches, the search for explanation need not be closed down by any specified techniques or adherence to a particular conception of agency or structure, holism or individualism.

So far realism cannot point to research significantly aided by its specific guidelines. Two recent examples of work claiming to be realist inspired are Sarre (1987) and Allen and McDowell (1989). Both suggest the great difficulty of 'applying' realist concepts from outside the research material. A possible implication is that if realism's role is better restricted to meta-theory, 'using' realist guidelines in the above sense is misguided. Though research output so far is limited, neither this nor the criticisms of opponents would appear to disqualify a more limited role for realism, in a philosophical and supportive form.

#### 4. Relationship Between Research Philosophies and Actual Research

It was suggested above first that my own research approach was one characterised by a progressive movement between data and theory, including specific use of extensive and intensive research. I do not argue that this approach was chosen after consideration of the type of research philosophies just presented, either in the specifically realist forms or from the broader 'camp' identified. However, I do consider that the two are compatible and that the research philosophies do broadly support the approach, in the following ways.

Firstly, at the most general level, they support a dual approach to the empirical and conceptual, emphasising their importance and the mutual informing of each by the other.

Secondly the emphasis of realism in particular on the search for generative mechanisms rather than covering law regularities can be seen as support for the intensive study of a small number of cases, for what Sayer calls 'non-predictive explanation', (1984, pp 120-122) - though this is a matter of emphasis rather than exclusive support.

Thirdly, and again on a general level, these philosophies encourage tolerance for a certain flexibility in research which matches my own experience. Thus Sayer (1984, p 228), despite specific and lengthy advice on appropriate research methods, is

obliged to conclude that often the best that can be managed is "an uneven and incomplete combination of results of extensive surveys (or fragments thereof), a few intensive 'case studies' and a host of statements about relatively simple constituent elements or events, all informed by abstract theoretical knowledge". This is a long way from the relative simplicity of the positivist social science texts of the 1960s.

Finally much of this thinking, particularly in its hermeneutic aspects, lends support to an understanding of the complexity of relations between knowledge and practice. The 'double hermeneutic' of social science, whereby it has to understand both its objects and its own concepts, applies firmly when considering actors making use of their knowledge in contexts such as this study. Sayer makes particularly clear the importance of the "partial identity of subject and object" (1984 p 29) in much social research - we already know in advance much of the meaning of the social phenomena we are looking at. Most knowledge is not developed intellectually, in propositional form (Sayer 1984, pp 17 and 180). This type of understanding is therefore compatible with the approach of Schon, mentioned above, to the use of knowledge by professional practitioners.

I do not wish to overemphasise the link being made here, as I have the impression that there is a considerable elasticity in the connection between most research designs and research philosophies. But I would argue that at the least the kind of research philosophies outlined above give better support to the approach used than would for example a classic positivist understanding of the relationship of data and theory.

## APPENDIX 4            Local Social Relations and Community Action

### Class and Consumption Sector

The debate of the 1980s about the theorisation of class, income and consumption patterns has been inconclusive. Even a firm Marxist like Harvey feels the need to bring in concepts additional to class (community, family, individual) to explain "urban consciousness" (Harvey 1989, Chapter 8). For present purposes it can be accepted that both income and work factors and forms of consumption of key elements of livelihood (such as housing, transport, education, childcare) influence attitudes to areas and propensities to different kinds of local involvement. All of these are related to 'class' whether used in the Marxist or Weberian senses. Though most older inner residential areas have residents mostly with low incomes, at least outside London, there are normally significant differentiations within these patterns of social class. These have been compounded by developing sectoral changes, so that areas with minimal car ownership, have often become majority owner occupied with significant proportions of car owners.

In 1976 Bell and Newby made the judgement that what "is frequently called 'community action' is in fact 'class action'. It is nearly always locally based, which because of the working of the housing market means intraclass not crossclass" (p 201). The sectoral and labour market fragmentation has weakened the truth of this view. One may say that there have been in schematic terms two types of area. One is the 'one class' area, without major sectoral divisions; where this was working class, the most common type before the 1970s, then this sort of area was likely to present a fairly inactive response to any council schemes, very likely accepting whatever redevelopment or, rarely, improvement proposals being offered. Partly this may have reflected agreement with such proposals, partly failure to respond or organise. This type then might partly explain the widespread acceptance of municipal schemes up to the early 1970s - and in many areas, virtually up to the present, whether those schemes had been changed to different sorts of rehabilitation of houses or provision/removal of other facilities or had simply been replaced by inaction. The middle class version of this type might be expected to demonstrate the opposite features - a strong likelihood of response, so much so that authorities

would rarely contemplate threatening schemes in such areas - even should they have grounds for doing so. This reflects the asymmetry likely as between middle and working class areas. The former enclose broadly a congruence of class and sector, as far as housing and transport are concerned, whilst this is not normally the case in working class areas.

Another circumstance, which can be described as cross-class and with sectoral divisions (the two going together), may well have been responsible for the majority of the reaction which halted clearance in the early 1970s, probably first in London and other 'gentrifying' cities (eg Oxford) and then around 1973-74 in the larger Midland and northern cities. The success of community action at this time in 'stopping the bulldozer' is a matter of dispute; it must be considered as at least one element in the reversal of policy; the action seems often to have been in areas with middle class residents or at least some middle class involvement, via early forms of 'community technical aid' - from students, young councillors, local academics and so on. The fact that more highly educated, often middle class people, found themselves in older and generally poor areas, either buying houses or renting as students or even squatting, led to new ideas about possible resistance to local councils or private developers and to new tactics. As the movement caught on, such people even deliberately moved into such areas with the organisation of action in mind. Sectoral/class changes other than housing were also appearing - for example new ideas on children's play or altered conceptions of acceptable environments, with implications for action about road traffic or industrial pollution.

Of the studies Stoker quotes of (degrees of) successful community action over urban renewal (1985 pp 555-6), nearly all seem to have such involvement, whether in Sunderland (Dennis 1972), Islington (Ferris 1972 - Barnsbury), Camden (Wates 1976 - Tolmers Square) or Covent Garden (Christensen 1979). The cases of Oxford (Jericho - Moore 1975), Manchester (Ladybarn, Withington, Didsbury - Stoker 1985) and Birmingham (Sparkbrook and elsewhere - Lambert et al 1978) all had responses first appearing in gentrifying areas or from externally stimulated neighbourhood projects. Then later such areas might well be those which would participate most actively in improvement schemes or on some other issues. However, as suggested above the new divisions and lifestyles which these areas contained also perhaps

worked in the opposite direction, excluding many issues from active consideration, given the prime concern with the individual property and frequently increased mobility via car ownership - so that for some very local facilities mattered less.

As was explained in Chapter 2 the study by Lambert, Paris and Blackaby (1978) related the failure of the council to make progress in two areas in Birmingham to the class/sector characteristics of the area. In one, in Balsall Heath, a small area was 'saved for improvement' in 1971 by the council (without local involvement) but residents were not able to push effectively for actual improvements, partly because of the very varied and rapidly changing nature of the population. In the other area, in Sparkbrook, residents were again unable to press forward their priorities for redevelopment and improvement. In both of these areas there was external support in the form of funded local Associations and community workers, though both were primarily working class, with mixed housing tenures. The authors conclude by emphasising the overall economic position of residents, rather than sector (tenure) differences; that thus they regard class in the sense of income as central, and see this as the main force causing differences within areas - though their detailed discussions do reveal other factors such as race. This study would therefore direct attention to intra-class differences. One might therefore regard this as a particular case of the one class area, even with some sectoral divisions.

Clearly the generalisation of these two types must be rather tentative, as it is very hard to demonstrate that particular action or inaction was caused precisely by these class/sector balances. However the greater involvement of middle class residents and owner occupiers in organised local activity on certain local issues (especially their own houses, threatening roads and some environmental matters) seems to be widely observed. Certainly class/sector can be seen as a force operating very widely on urban renewal and local planning changes, even though the precise effects are often hard to identify.

### Gender

The effects of local 'gender regimes', to use a concept developed by Connell (1987), must be regarded as virtually unstudied in Britain - quite certainly so in



relation to local planning in the inner area context. A number of recent analyses point to the probable direction of such effects, and the most that one can do is work from these suggestions. It is clear at any rate that there are strong connections between gender relations and the built environment and that women, though often not in control of major changes, are far from passive in this process - as for example Mackenzie makes clear in an essay on the way women have operated their "domestic-community work" by "maximising necessary family resources" (Little, Peake and Richardson ed 1988 p45). This understanding can be filled out from two angles.

Firstly it is clear that all built environments encapsulate and constrain to significant, though varying degrees, particular gender relations: "different combinations of the physical form of the built environment, and the history of gender and class relations, create patterns of gender relations specific to particular localities" (Foord, McDowell and Bowlby 1986, p21). This is so at all spatial 'levels', in the house, street, neighbourhood, district, city, though naturally in different ways. History has ordered these relations in changing ways, with the welfare state making dramatic alterations in the sites and social relations involved in many aspects of the reproduction of labour power. So Cockburn observes that part of this reproduction is not based in homes or near them but in large scale operations of income support, secondary or higher education, big hospitals and so on (Cockburn 1977). The built environment reflects very clearly these changes in the 'point of reproduction' but one has to look carefully to see who is involved in particular tasks, on what terms - very often women remain the main administrators and manual employees of this degree of socialised care, as school or hospital or office employees. And the built environment of the older residential neighbourhood remains host to many of the same roles as those for which it was built 80 or 100 years ago - women still the main carers of children, of the elderly, of husbands. Of course extensive changes could occur within this existing built environment (and, as stated, have done up to a point) but the conclusion of the Women and Geography Study Group (1984) seems reasonable: "the present spatial and temporal organisation of urban areas hinders the integration of public and private activities for women and for men" (p65). In other words the organisation of 'private' space, in homes mainly, and

'public' space - streets, shops, pubs etc, reinforces divisions of aspects of life which are organised along gender lines.

Secondly, seeing the same point from another angle, the consumption practices, the daily tasks, fall out in space differently for women and men, at all levels. Space is generally used quite distinctively, in terms of timing and purpose. Banion and Stubbs (1986) emphasise this in terms of each house(hold), to try to bring out that the political economy of housing must grasp not only how houses are produced and allocated (construction, tenures) but also how they are variably occupied and how gender and household forms interrelate with design and tenure and control. For far more women than men the house is workplace as well as living place, even though women may quite likely have another workplace too and many men in the inner cities have no workplaces. This is less clear cut than it was, as Pahl (1984) emphasises, in that unemployment, the rise of do-it-yourself and changing social attitudes have been changing some household practices, but the point must still hold in general. The same applies for the use of the neighbourhood and its facilities (or lack of them), the access to health care, to shops, the use of public and private transport - all experienced differently by men and women. Of course gender is only one determinant of this use - age, culture, class all matter too; one only has to think of the different things that people expect of the streets near to their homes to realise this. But within any one neighbourhood gender would probably be a key factor.

The effects on neighbourhood action of gender have hardly been pursued at an academic level though it has been argued for more than a decade that women are particularly important to such action, as to whether it happens and how, and in an anecdotal way there has been discussion of women's involvement in community action (for example Mayo 1977). The effects may be summarised in three ways. Firstly, by weakening community action generally gender relations have contributed towards that lack of response to urban renewal and local planning initiatives which has been present in poor, inner areas at most times. This points up a central theme of community action - its absence in all sorts of issues. Large swathes of factors affecting the daily material conditions of women's home and neighbourhood based work simply never become issues - the organisation of non-school child care, the

arrangement of schooling, the access to shops, the regulation of air and noise near to the home, the physical condition of the home and so on. Only when understood jointly with gender relations can the structuring by class, sector and race of these non-issues begin to make sense.

The second effect is simply the other side of the first - that more 'male oriented' issues will have been raised in urban renewal, lending more emphasis for example to housing and some transport questions and less to childcare, shops or street environment. Thirdly however one can observe increasing female involvement in urban renewal issues of all kinds since the early 1970s, with changes from the women's movement and work experiences, as well as changing male attitudes.

This is the point emphasised by Bondi and Peake in their analysis of gender and urban politics: "women tend to be more concerned than men with their local residential environment" (Little, Peake and Richardson ed 1988, p33) and are especially likely to be involved in "informal politics", which is more continuous with everyday experience than party or more conventional political activity (1988, p35-6).

These three effects must again be hard to substantiate from particular cases. Certainly the earlier urban renewal 'causes celebres' were primarily over housing and major roads and these issues are of course of central interest to women as well as men. But increasingly children's play, health and safety, shopping and other more purely 'reproductive' issues have been raised and this seems to reflect increasing women's involvement. Given the simultaneous operation of many factors the effects can be more sensed from experience than historically proven. Overall one can argue that urban renewal and associated planning has responded to the current state of gender relations by failing to alter provision, change built environments or create new facilities which would be adequate to new sorts of gender relations. In that sense there has been reinforcement of the effects of class/sector and race relations by reducing the pressures for change. This has naturally interacted with the other facets in complex ways - for example the generally greater effect of the women's movement on middle class women (and men), and the lesser effect on most black people and working class residents,

introduces yet further biases as to who is likely to be involved and what issues they are likely to be raising. The total absence of Asian women from most community action is an obvious example (at least from Birmingham and other big city experience). One could not claim that this exhausts even initial ideas on the effects of gender relations. It only gives some suggestions as to where to start looking.

### Ethnicity/Race

A third evident feature of inner, especially older, residential areas has been the extent of black settlement, primarily since the 1950s. Though this has been the subject of extensive academic interest, only limited links have been made to analysis of local action and local planning. At the citywide level some connections have been made, for example by Jacobs (1986) and Ben-Tovim et al (1986), for the effects on party and pressure group politics. More locally two facets are worthy of note, one being the effects of the businesses set up by Asian and Afro-Caribbean residents, the other the effects of the residential settlement in itself.

In some inner areas at least there has been a significant relationship between black businesses and local planning and renewal, which justifies some attention here.

One may think of three categories of ethnic small capital - industrial, retailing and 'residual' (very marginal informal, often home based activity). The 'residual' category often worsens the environment of poor inner areas, absorbs some energies of public regulatory bodies and provides a small amount of local income. It is hardly likely to provide a significant base for local actions. The decline of local shops for many years weakened the economic and social base of the areas, probably removing certain potential kinds of local political or community activists. In so far as this trend has been partly reversed, mainly by ethnic businesses, this has had the opposite effect, bringing back some money and enthusiasm into the areas, and improving especially the main shopping frontage environment. Other ethnic businesses have had a similar overall effect, although their general weakness in most areas has limited this. Ethnic entrepreneurs will certainly have strengthened local religious and cultural activities, by funding these on a significant scale - with big

differences being evident between those groups with some business success and those with none.

So, in spite of the limited progress of ethnic businesses and the very uneven fortunes of small shops, one must count these as significant influences on urban renewal processes. When local individuals or public agencies are considering investments or trying to find new initiatives, the overall atmosphere created by a collapsed or, quite commonly now, a mildly revived, retailing, with a few other small businesses, matters. The presence of locally based small capital contributes both to the nature of local civil society, to some political activity, and gives state agencies something to grasp when pursuing particular policies. Many of the recent schemes supported for example under Inner Area Programmes or through Task Forces have depended on such presence, in terms of reviving shopping centres or supporting small firms - as well of course as trying to create what does not exist.

The results may have been variable, being built on such uncertain and shifting sands. The projects have been generally skewed to what business leaders (usually male and from particular Asian communities) and officials or leading councillors favour - for visible, larger scale schemes. But still the effect will be to focus some resources at the small area, or, more likely, district level and so promote a degree of local influence. Against this emphasis one must not forget the general absence of large capital and the way this pulls in quite the opposite direction.

Small area data, though imperfect for the purposes of identifying black settlement in small areas accurately, suggest that the degree of segregation does not approach the status of a ghetto, even though in some areas the combined total of all Asian and Afro-Caribbean groups may be a majority of residents. This means that all neighbourhoods are mixtures, both of different black groups and of black and white residents.

One can suggest three effects of this settlement at the local level. The first has been the way in which it has created greater social divisions and thus less ability to organise community opposition or initiatives than might otherwise have been the case. This is not easy to illustrate, given the absence of extensive accounts. From

the 1960s one can cite Rex and Moore's study (1967) of Sparkbrook in Birmingham, which found 'colonies' and extensive separate organisation. In the 1970s Ward's study (1979) of Moss Side in Manchester showed multi-racial opposition to clearance, based on the long history of black settlement in this area. Lambert et al's study (1978) of redevelopment and improvement areas in Birmingham in the early 1970s, showed race as one of several elements in the great diversity of interests observed among residents (sectoral and intra-class gradings, eg about 'problem families', were others). It seems very likely that this weakening factor has continued through from the inability to resist (insensitive) clearance, to the failure to take effective part in improvement programmes and various planning initiatives - again the absence of black residents' involvement is widely remarked upon.

The second effect relates to the levels of black organisation. The fact that in English cities very few areas are even close to being all black has meant that organisations have not generally operated at the very local level. The extent of spatial dispersal has meant that organisation has tended to be partly at citywide level, as described by Jacobs (1986) looking at the operations of groups like the Indian Workers Association or of bodies like the Community Relations Councils, but especially at district level. Community leaders were thus normally rather above the neighbourhood level. So on the whole citywide bodies were uneasy alliances, irregular meetings, of district level organisations. This is brought out in the study by Ben-Tovim and others (1986) of groups in Liverpool and Wolverhampton.

Overall the location of black organisation has probably tended to reduce involvement in much urban renewal and local planning activity where this has centred on neighbourhoods, because of the definition of programmes or the municipal organisation. This tendency may have been counteracted in two ways; firstly because the bases of such district structures still have to be somewhere and forms of contact and involvement would sometimes grow from this fact, creating informal networks and influence. Secondly some authorities, especially since the late 1970s, have tended to operate more on a project basis and this might as well focus on districts as neighbourhoods. The result might then be to start with these black organisations and work back via the projects to some neighbourhood activities.

The result of these tendencies might be that on some neighbourhood issues - perhaps some employment, leisure or shopping schemes - there would be much black involvement, whereas with more local questions of houses, play spaces, streets, this would be less. Probably the effect of this and the first (social division) factor has been gradually reduced in recent years, as black residents have become rather more involved at all levels.

The third local effect identified here is that of riots, which have in the big cities been predominantly expressions of black discontent. They have focused public attention on both particular districts and on small parts of those districts which have been physically damaged. These parts have usually been shopping streets and so the impetus has been less towards specific neighbourhoods and more to reinforce or initiate schemes for these main road frontages, although there has certainly been some spin off to adjoining neighbourhoods, especially in terms of consultation machinery - attempts at more responsive renewal and planning processes.

Overall then the effects of black settlement have been very contradictory for urban renewal histories, weakening some forms of collective action, generating new forms of organisation and creating an overall social turbulence that has both attracted government and 'charitable' attention, and on occasion resources, and probably also distracted or deterred the attention of some other institutions - private capital, white residents. At the same time the forces within these small areas have both been weakened and been lent some new weight by their changing populations.